

Why the 14th Amendment is a political Trojan horse

**and did not make a “citizen of the United States” of
anyone born in one of the Union states, including slaves.**

By Thomas Clark Nelson.

A treatise, revealing: the source of the seeming infinity of governmental absurdities over the last 150 years, early among which is the 14th Amendment, which appears to make citizens of all the slaves but in actuality only makes federal subjects of those born in the District of Columbia or one of the territories—but more importantly, operates to imply that Congress are authorized to exercise personal legislative jurisdiction over all the American People, a power expressly precluded by the supreme organic instrument of creation of the American Republic, the Declaration of Independence; the identity of the foreign principals controlling Congress throughout this entire period; and the remedy, both personal and national, authorized by law for this situation.

January 3, 2013.

Disclaimer.

The contents hereof are not intended as legal advice, should not be inferred to be such, and are offered strictly in the spirit of education, scholarship, research, and helping one's fellow Man through the sharing of his experiences.

There is no recommendation that the reader apply any of said material to his life and no guarantee of results in the event that he does; but by the same token, there is no known falsehood within these pages.

Further, the writer hereof has never suggested that someone do what he has not done himself or would not do.

The reader should undertake a particular course of action not because it is written here, but only because of his own due diligence, verification and evaluation of pertinent facts, and realization of personal certainty in the matter under consideration.

The authors whose work is quoted herein are thanked for their diligence and scholarship. This treatise is offered free of charge and is intended for the reader's erudition as set forth above, to be adopted or rejected as the reader sees fit.

Preface.

In order to evade and defeat the provisions of the Declaration of Independence and Constitution—in their quest to secure, in behalf of their masters at the private Bank of England (parent bank of the future private Federal Reserve), personal legislative power and jurisdiction over the American People, i.e., the creators and supreme political authority of the United States of America—Congress, in 1864, change the legal meaning of the word “state” to exclude all the states of the Union and include only the territories and District of Columbia.

They do this under cover of the Civil War and thereafter withhold the new “legal” definition and meaning from the American People.

The Civil Rights Act of 1866, the 14th, 16th, and 18th Amendments to the Constitution, and every single other legislative act since June 30, 1864, without exception, hews to the said new definition. The “secret” is concealed through the ongoing use of convoluted and essentially unfathomable definitions of “State” and “United States,” which exclude, by deliberate act, what people normally think of when they hear “State” or “United States.” For example, there are *75 different definitions* of “United States” in the 50 titles of the United States Code; all of which however, upon decryption, mean nothing more than (1) the District of Columbia (only), or (2) in certain segments thereof, the collective of the District of Columbia and certain of the Territories.

The novel, so-called *citizen of the United States*, introduced in 1866, is a *subject* and *person* (not a sovereign or man) and a *United States Government employee* (expressly defined as such in sections 552a(a)(2) and (13) of Title 5 *Government Organization and Employees* of the United States Code), whose legal residence is the District of Columbia: defined territory over which Congress exercise absolute exclusive personal legislative power and jurisdiction.

Why the 14th Amendment is a political Trojan horse provides documentary evidence of the foregoing and other related facts and reveals the personal and national remedies authorized by law for such situation. *Purging America of the Matrix* follows with the heretofore undisclosed nature of the Declaration of Independence and practical examples of how anyone born in one of the Union states, including former slaves, is authorized by law to dissolve the presumption of his status as a United States Government employee (whose residence, for legal purposes, is the District of Columbia) and recover his original standing and all unalienable Rights to which he is entitled, as intended by the Founding Fathers, which rights include, among others, Liberty; specifically: freedom from personal subjection to any act of any legislature, State or Federal, and the grasp of executive power.

Thomas Clark Nelson.
January 3, 2013.

Why the 14th Amendment is a political Trojan horse

**and did not make a “citizen of the United States” of
anyone born in one of the Union states, including slaves.**

By Thomas Clark Nelson.

As of July 4, 1776, the People of the United States of America are self-protecting, self-governing sovereigns who enjoy all unalienable Rights with which all men are endowed by their Creator, among which are “Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness,” and live under common law,¹ free of the grasp of executive power and personal subjection to statutory law.² These facts distinguish the new nation from all others; *to wit*:

[A]t the Revolution, the sovereignty devolved on the people, and they are truly the sovereigns of the country, but they are sovereigns without subjects . . . and have none to govern but themselves . . . [Chisholm v. Georgia, 2 U.S. (2 Dall.) 419, 472 (1793)]

For roughly the next 175 years, there is no such thing as a *law enforcement officer*, only *peace officers*,³ and Americans living throughout the Union enjoy lives free of molestation by their servants in government. The term “law enforcement officer,” an abbreviation of *statutory-law enforcement officer*, will not begin to appear in law dictionaries until the 1950s.⁴

Two species of legislative power.

An 1821 Supreme Court case reveals that the totality of the legislative power of Congress is categorized properly into two distinct species; *to wit*:

It is clear that Congress, as a legislative body, exercise two species of legislative power: the one limited as to its objects, but extending all over the Union: the other, an absolute exclusive legislative power over the District of Columbia. . . .⁵

¹common law, *n.* [fr. Law French *commen ley* “common law”] . . . The body of law to which no constitution or statute applies . . . *Black’s Law Dictionary*, 7th ed., s.v. “Common law.”

Common Law, In Great Britain and the United States, the *unwritten* law, the law that receives its binding force from immemorial usage and universal reception, in distinction from the *written*, or statute law. That body of rules, principles, and customs which have been received from our ancestors and by which courts have been governed in their judicial decisions. . . . *Webster’s Dictionary*, 1828 ed., s.v. “Common.”

²statutory law. The body of law derived from statutes rather than from constitutions or judicial decisions. — Also termed *statute law*, *legislative law* . . . *Black’s Law Dictionary*, 7th ed., s.v. “Statutory law.”

statute. A law passed by a legislative body. . . . *Ibid*, s.v. “Statute.”

statute law, a legislative enactment; written law, as distinguished from the common or unwritten law. *Funk & Wagnalls Dictionary*, 1903 ed., s.v. “Law.”

³Peace officers. . . . includes sheriffs and their deputies, constables, marshals, members of the police force of cities, and other officers whose duty it is to enforce and preserve the public peace. . . . *Black’s Law Dictionary*, 4th ed. (1951), s.v. “Peace.”

Public peace. The peace or tranquility of the community in general; the good order and repose of the people composing a state or municipality. . . . That invisible sense of security which every man feels so necessary to his comfort, and for which all governments are instituted. . . . *Ibid*.

⁴LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER. Those whose duty it is to preserve the peace. *Ibid*, s.v. “Law enforcement officer.”

⁵*Cohens v. Virginia*, 19 U.S. 264, 6 Wheat. 265, 5 L.Ed. 257 (1821).

The species of legislative power “limited as to its objects, but extending all over the Union” is known as *subject-matter jurisdiction*; the other, “an absolute exclusive legislative power over the District of Columbia,” is plenary⁶ and includes, in addition to subject-matter jurisdiction, *territorial* and *personal jurisdiction*; *to wit*:

JURISDICTION . . . Power of governing or legislating. . . . *Jurisdiction*, in its most general sense, is the power to make, declare, or apply the law . . . *Jurisdiction* is limited to place or territory, persons, or to particular subjects. . . . [Webster’s Dictionary, 1828 ed., s.v. “Jurisdiction”]

Before personal jurisdiction may be exercised by a court against a particular American, however, said forum must have territorial jurisdiction; *to wit*:

forum . . . 2 a : a judicial body or assembly . . . b : the territorial jurisdiction of a court forum before personal jurisdiction may be exercised — *National Law Journal* [Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law, 1996 ed., s.v. “Forum”]

territorial jurisdiction. . . . Jurisdiction over cases arising in or involving persons residing within a defined territory. . . . [Black’s Law Dictionary, 7th ed., s.v. “Jurisdiction”]

I.e., a United States District Court has *personal* jurisdiction only over those residing in the defined territory over which the said court has *territorial* jurisdiction (i.e., over which Congress are authorized by the Constitution to exercise territorial legislative power).

In 1776, however, there is no judiciary and no such geographical territory (the 13 “Free and Independent States” of the new confederation are free and independent).

Upon establishment of the district of territory comprising the seat of the Government of the United States, later known as the District of Columbia,⁷ as provided in Article 1 § 8(17) of the Constitution (adopted September 17, 1787, ratified June 21, 1788, implemented March 4, 1789) and referenced impliedly in Article 4 § 3(2) thereof, Congress, for the first time in history, have:

- Defined territory, by the name of the District of Columbia, over which they exercise exclusive *territorial* legislative power (rule); and
- Residents, i.e., inhabitants of the District of Columbia, over whom they exercise exclusive *personal* legislative power (govern), via the consent of said inhabitants.

Article 1 § 8(17) and Article 4 § 3(2), the territorial clause, of the Constitution provide, respectively and in pertinent part:

The Congress shall have Power . . . To exercise exclusive Legislation . . . over such District . . . as may . . . become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and . . . like Authority over all Places purchased . . . for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings; . . .

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; . . .

Whereas, it is clear that the Constitution authorizes Congress to exercise personal legislative power over residents of the geographical territory subject to the plenary jurisdiction provided in Articles 1 § 8(17) and 4 § 3(2), it is devoid of provision that authorizes exercise of such power over the sovereign American People of the several states of the Union.

⁶*plenary jurisdiction*. . . . A court’s full and absolute power over the subject matter and the parties in a case. *Black’s Law Dictionary*, 7th ed., s.v. “Jurisdiction.”

⁷Congressional provision for “a district of territory . . . for the permanent seat of the government of the United States” appears in the Act of July 16, 1790 (1 Stat. 130), and is referred to unofficially as the Territory of Columbia; later given the official name District of Columbia as of the Act of May 6, 1796 (1 Stat. 461).

Notwithstanding the indisputable accuracy of the foregoing statement, it is more than obvious that Congress today exercise personal legislative power over the lives, liberty, and property of Americans not just in the District of Columbia and other places/property belonging to the United States, but throughout the Union, as well. Either Congress are exceeding the powers authorized by the Declaration of Independence and the limitations imposed by the Constitution or there is some other factor, evidently unobserved essentially by all, that gives all three branches of the United States Government personal jurisdiction over those Americans.

The 14th Amendment “citizen of the United States”.

The Fourteenth Article of Amendment to the Constitution, passed June 13, 1866, and ratified July 9, 1868, is one of the most confounding pieces of legislation ever to issue from the Halls of Congress and is still with us today (and not a historical footnote) because, evidently, no one with sufficient influence to effectuate its repeal understands the legal meaning of “citizen of the United States” (revealed fully *infra*). Section 1 of the said Amendment provides:

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. [Emphasis added.]

Examination of the origin, definition, and meaning of certain words, phrases, and legal terms appearing in the provisions of said Section 1, including “persons,” “subject” (both noun and adjective), “citizens,” “reside,” “privileges,” “immunities,” and “protection of the laws” vis-à-vis 1866 America, as follows herein below, reveals its precise meaning and import.

“Persons”.

A comprehensive understanding of what is—and what is not—a *person* can be gleaned from the following:

pě'r'sŏn (or -sn), *n.* [L *persona*, lit., a face mask used by actors on the stage, hence a character, a person, from *personare*, to sound through; *per* through, and *sonare*, to sound.] . . . [Webster's Dictionary, new 20th cent. ed. (unabr.), s.v. “Person”]

person. . . . “So far as legal theory is concerned, a person is any being whom the law regards as capable of rights and duties. Any being that is so capable is a person, whether a human being or not . . . Persons are the substances of which rights and duties are the attributes. . . .” [Emphasis added.] [Black's Law Dictionary, 7th ed., s.v. “Person”]

PERSON. . . . A man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the right to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. . . . A county is a person in a legal sense . . . but a sovereign is not Persons are the subject of rights and duties ; and, as a subject of a right, the person is the object of the correlative duty, and conversely. . . . [Emphasis added.] [Ibid, 3rd ed., s.v. “Person”]

Homo vocabulum est naturæ; persona juris civilis. Man (*homo*) is a term of nature; person (*persona*) of civil law. . . . [Ibid, 2nd ed., s.v. “Homo vocabulum est naturæ; persona juris civilis”]

[I]n common usage, the term “person” does not include the sovereign . . . [Emphasis added.] [Wilson v. Omaha Indian Tribe, 442 U.S. 653 (1979)]

[A]t the Revolution, the sovereignty devolved on the people, and they are truly the sovereigns of the country . . . [Emphasis added.] [Chisholm v. Georgia, *supra*, p. 1]

“Rights and duties”.

The common theme, express or implied, in any definition or description of “person” in either constitutional, statutory, or case law is that a *person* is the subject of *rights and duties*; *to wit*:

ARTIFICIAL. Created by art, or by law ; existing only by force of or in contemplation of law. [*Black’s Law Dictionary*, 2nd ed., s.v. “Artificial”]

artificial person *noun* : JURISTIC PERSON [*Merriam-Webster’s Unabridged Dictionary*, inc. version 2.5, s.v. “Artificial person”]

juristic person *noun* : a body of persons, a corporation, a partnership, or other legal entity that is recognized by law as the subject of rights and duties called also *artificial person*, *conventional person*, *fictitious person* [U/L emphasis added.] [Ibid, s.v. “Juristic person”]

RIGHT. . . . The term “right,” in civil society, is defined to mean that which a man is entitled to have, or to do, or to receive from others within the limits prescribed by law. . . . [Emphasis added.] [*Black’s Law Dictionary*, 2nd ed., s.v. “Right”]

duty. . . . A legal obligation that is owed or due to another and that needs to be satisfied; an obligation for which somebody else has a corresponding right. . . . [Emphasis added.] [Ibid, 7th ed., s.v. “Duty”]

Duty. A human action which is exactly conformable to the laws which require us to obey them. . . . An obligation one has by law or contract. . . . A thing due; that which is due from a person; that which a person owes to another; an obligation to do a thing. . . . [Emphasis added.] [Ibid, 6th ed.]

The American People, creators of the Declaration of Independence, United States of America, and Constitution, are the supreme political authority in America; *to wit*:

The People in their capacity as Sovereigns made and adopted the Constitution . . . [4 Wheat 402]

SOVEREIGN. A chief ruler with supreme power ; one possessing sovereignty. . . . [*Bouvier’s Law Dictionary*, 6th ed., s.v. “Sovereign”]

SOVEREIGNTY. The supreme, absolute, and uncontrollable power by which any independent state is governed ; supreme political authority . . . [*Black’s Law Dictionary*, 3rd ed., s.v. “Sovereignty”]

Sovereignty itself is, of course not subject to law, for it is the author and source of law; but in our system, while sovereign powers are delegated to the agencies of government, sovereignty itself remains with the people, by whom and for whom all government exists and acts. [*Yick Wo v. Hopkins and Woo Lee v. Hopkins*, 118 US S.Ct. 356]

The sovereignty of the United States resides in the people, and Congress cannot invoke the sovereignty of the people to override their will as declared in the Constitution. . . . [*Perry v. United States*, 294 U.S. 330 (1935)]

“Subject”.

A *subject* or *person* represents the antithesis of a *sovereign*—who neither is *subject* to the power, control, or will of another nor does he have any *duty* toward another; *to wit*:

¹*subject* . . . *noun* . . . 1: one that is placed under the authority, dominion, control, or influence of someone or something: as a : one bound in allegiance or service to a feudal superior : VASSAL b (1) : one subject to a monarch or ruler and governed by his law (2) one who lives in the territory of, enjoys the protection of, and owes allegiance to a sovereign power or state . . . [*Merriam-Webster’s Unabridged Dictionary*, inc. version 2.5, s.v. “Subject”]

²*subject* . . . *adjective* . . . 1: falling under or submitting to the power or dominion of another . . . owing allegiance to or being a subject of a particular sovereign or state . . . [Ibid.]

Wherefore, it is clear that a sovereign *per se*, is never a subject of *rights* or *duties*; such as *civil rights*, e.g., “protection by the [statutory] laws,” and *political duties*, e.g., payment of income tax, which can be enforced ultimately only through the application of deadly force, a species of executive power (personal jurisdiction) which Congress are authorized to exercise only in the District of Columbia and other places/property belonging to the United States.

“Citizens”.

A *citizen* is a species of *person* with origins in ancient Rome who is the *subject* of *rights and duties* and has certain *privileges and immunities*. Citizens do not have unalienable Rights, only entitlement to civil (municipal) rights, and are *subjects*, not *sovereigns*; *to wit*:

CITIZEN. In general. A member of a free city or jural society [⁸] (*civitas*,) [⁹] possessing all the rights and privileges which can be enjoyed by any person under its constitution and government, and subject to the corresponding duties.

In American law. One who, under the constitution and laws of the United States, or of a particular state, and by virtue of birth or naturalization within the jurisdiction, is a member of the political community, owing allegiance and being entitled to the enjoyment of full civil rights. . . .

The term “citizen” has come to us derived from antiquity. It appears to have been used in the Roman government to designate a person who had the freedom of the city, and the right to exercise all political and civil privileges of the government. . . . [U/L emphasis added.] [*Black’s Law Dictionary*, 2nd ed., s.v. “Citizen”]

citizen . . . a native or naturalized person of either sex who owes allegiance to a government and is entitled to reciprocal protection from it and to enjoyment of the rights of citizenship [*Merriam-Webster’s Unabridged Dictionary*, inc. version 2.5, s.v. “Citizen”]

“Reside”.

A *resident*, i.e., one who *resides* in a place, may or may not be a *person* (the subject of rights and duties), depending on the place and other factors; *to wit*:

reside. . . . to dwell permanently or continuously : have a settled abode for a time : have one’s residence or domicile . . .

synonyms RESIDE, despite the fact that it is somewhat formal, may be the preferred term for expressing the idea that a person keeps or returns to a particular dwelling place as his fixed, settled, or legal abode [Emphasis added.] [Ibid, s.v. “Reside”]

RESIDENT. One who has his residence in a place.

“Resident” and “inhabitant” are distinguishable in meaning. The word “inhabitant” implies a more fixed and permanent abode than does “resident;” [*sic*] and a resident may not be entitled to all the privileges or subject to all the duties of an inhabitant. [Emphasis added.] [*Black’s Law Dictionary*, 4th ed., s.v. “Resident”]

Residence. The act or fact of living in a given place for some time. . . . Residence usu. just means bodily presence as an inhabitant in a given place; domicile usu. requires bodily presence plus an intention to make the place one’s home. A person thus may have more than one residence at a time, but only one domicile. Sometimes, though, the two terms are used synonymously. Cf. DOMICILE. . . . [U/L emphasis added.] [Ibid, 7th ed., s.v. “Residence”]

Domicile. . . . 1. The place at which a person is physically present and that the person regards as home; a person’s true, fixed, principal, and permanent home, to which that person intends to return and remain even though currently residing elsewhere. . . . 2. The residence of a person . . . for legal purposes. Also termed (in sense 2) legal residence. . . . [U/L emphasis added.] [Ibid, s.v. “Domicile”]

⁸JURAL. . . . Founded in law ; organized upon the basis of a fundamental law, and existing for the recognition and protection of rights. Thus, the term “jural society” is used as the synonym of “state” or “organized political community.” *Black’s Law Dictionary*, 2nd ed., s.v. “Jural.”

⁹CIVITAS. Lat. In the Roman law. Any body of people living under the same laws : a state. . . . Ibid, s.v. “Civitas.”

The words “reside,” “resident,” and “residence” may involve legal interpretation, as alluded to in the latter portion of each respective foregoing definition. I.e., it is not necessary for one to take up housekeeping within a particular jurisdiction in order to establish legal residence therein; *to wit*: The legal residence of officers and employees of the Government of the United States, members of the uniformed services, and other Federal personnel physically residing without the geographical limits of the District of Columbia—the location of their employer, the Government of the United States¹⁰—nevertheless is the District of Columbia for legal purposes.

“Privileges and immunities”.

So-called *privileges and immunities* do not attach to *sovereigns*, i.e., the American People (nontaxpayers¹¹), only *subjects* and *citizens* (taxpayers¹²), i.e., residents, actual or legal, of territory/places/property belonging to the United States; *to wit*:

PRIVILEGE. A particular and peculiar benefit or advantage enjoyed by a person, company, or class, beyond the common advantages of other citizens. An exceptional or extraordinary power or exemption. A right, power, franchise, or immunity held by a person or class, against or beyond the course of the law.

Privilege is an exemption from some burden or attendance, with which certain persons are indulged, from a supposition of law that the stations they fill, or the offices they are engaged in, are such as require all their time and care, and that, therefore, without this indulgence, it would be impracticable to execute such offices to that advantage which the public good requires. . . . [Emphasis added.] [*Black’s Law Dictionary*, 2nd ed., s.v. “Privilege”]

Immunity. Exemption, as from serving in an office, or performing duties which the law generally requires other citizens to perform; e.g. exemption from paying taxes. Freedom or exemption from penalty, burden, or duty. Special privilege. [U/L emphasis added.] [*Ibid*, 5th ed., s.v. “Immunity”]

“Protection of the laws”.

The phrase “protection of the laws” is a truncation of *protection of the statutory laws*. The American People, via the Constitution, authorize Congress to exercise personal legislative power via enactment of statutory laws—but only over persons residing in (1) the District of Columbia, (2) “all Places purchased,” and (3) “Territory or other Property belonging to the United States.”

In 1866 America, the only persons needful of, and entitled to, *equal protection of the statutory laws* are residents of (1) the District of Columbia, (2) any of the said places purchased, or (3) any of the other property (territories) belonging to the United States.

Americans making their home in one of the respective Union states are self-protecting (*ref.* 2nd Amendment to the Constitution), self-governing (*Chisholm v. Georgia, supra*, p. 1) sovereigns (*Perry v. U.S., supra*, p. 4) who enjoy “Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness” under common law (*supra*, n. 1), free of subjection to statutory law (*supra*, n. 2), the grasp of executive power, and interference from their servants in Government.

¹⁰Article 1 § 8(17) of the Constitution establishes the “Seat [place] of the Government of the United States.”

¹¹The revenue laws are a code or system in regulation of tax assessment and collection. They relate to taxpayers, and not to nontaxpayers. The latter are without their scope. No procedure is prescribed for nontaxpayers, and no attempt is made to annul any of their rights and remedies in due course of law. With them Congress does not assume to deal, and they are neither of the subject nor of the object of the revenue laws. [Emphasis added.] *Long v. Rasmussen*, [9 Cir.] D.C.Mont. 1922, 281 F. 236.

¹²Slater’s protestations to the effect that he derives no benefit from the United States government have no bearing on his legal obligation to pay income taxes. . . . Unless the defendant can establish that he is not a citizen of the United States, the IRS possesses authority to attempt to determine his federal tax liability. [Emphasis added.] *United States v. Slater* (D. Del., 1982), 545 F.Supp. 179, 182.

See n. 10, *supra*.

Preliminary summary of facts.

Whereas, the Declaration of Independence in 1776, Constitution in 1789, and Supreme Court in 1793 all tell us, impliedly or expressly, that the several states of the Union are populated by *sovereigns*, not *subjects*; the Congress in 1866 purportedly decree via the 14th Amendment, albeit impliedly, that the “author and source of law” (*Yick Wo et al, supra*, p. 4) and “sovereigns of the country” (*Chisholm, supra*, p. 1), i.e., the American People, are no longer *sovereigns* but rather *persons* and *citizens* and the *subject of rights and duties* conferred by their servants in Congress who, evidently, are posing as their political superiors.

Whereas, it is easy to condemn this particular section of the 14th Amendment as outrageous and false, such approach produces no relief, as the above notions are only *implied*, not expressed.

Wherefore, we are better served not by asserting how this portion of the 14th Amendment is false, but *by discovering how it might be true*.

In 1866 it is well settled that Congress have *no personal legislative power* over the American People per se (i.e., those who make their home in one of the respective several states of the Union), only those residing in the District of Columbia or one of the other places/properties belonging to the United States.

If the foregoing is factual and true—and it is—how can Congress in the 14th Amendment infer that *all* Americans, both those of the Union states and those residing in territory/places/property belonging to the United States, are the *subject of rights and duties*, i.e., *persons* and *citizens*, and ignore the sovereign standing of the American People?

Congress cannot. Yet the provisions of Section 1 appear to indicate otherwise.

Something is missing from the equation.

Congress disregard the letter and spirit of the Declaration of Independence and Constitution and set about to deceive and defraud the American People.

Sensus verborum est anima legis. The meaning of words is the spirit of the law.¹³

Proprietates verborum observerandæ sunt. The proprieties of words (i. e. proper meanings of words) are to be observed.

Quoties in verbis nulla est ambiguitas ibi nulla expositio contra verba fienda est. When there is no ambiguity in the words, then no exposition contrary to the words is to be made.

¹³ *Bouvier's Law Dictionary*, 3rd rev., 8th ed., s.v. “Maxim.” Hereinafter, italicized text in Latin followed by its underlined translation in English signifies a maxim of law, each of which, unless noted otherwise, is found in *Bouvier's Law Dictionary*, 3rd rev., 8th ed., s.v. “Maxim,” pp. 2122–2168, defined and described as follows:

MAXIM. An established principle [*see maxims immediately below*] or proposition. A principle of law universally admitted, as being a correct statement of the law, or as agreeable to natural reason. [Sir Edward] Coke defines a maxim to be “conclusion of reason,” and says . . . in another place: “A maxime is a proposition to be of all men confessed and granted without prooffe, argument, or discourse.” . . . *Black's Law Dictionary*, 2nd ed., s.v. “Maxim.”

Maxime ita dicta quia maxima est ejus dignitas et certissima auctoritas, atque quod maxime omnibus probetur. A maxim is so called because its dignity is chiefest, and its authority the most certain, and because universally approved by all.

Contra negantem principia non est disputandum. There is no disputing against or denying principles. *Bouvier's Law Dictionary*, 6th ed., s.v. “Maxim.”

Quæ ad unum finem locuta sunt, non debent ad alium detorqueri. Words spoken to one end, ought not to be perverted to another.

Sensus verborum ex causa dicendi accipiendus est, et sermones semper accipiendi sunt secundum subjectam materiam. The sense of words is to be taken from the occasion of speaking them, and discourses are always to be interpreted according to the subject-matter.

Si nulla sit conjectura quæ ducat alio, verba intelligenda sunt ex proprietate, non grammatica sed populari ex usu. If there be no conjecture which leads to a different result, words are to be understood, according to the proper meaning, not in a grammatical, but in a popular and ordinary sense.

Verba ita sunt intelligenda, ut res magis valeat quam pereat. Words are to be so understood that the subject-matter may be preserved rather than destroyed.

A verbis legis non est recedendum. From the words of the law there must be no departure.

Nil tamere novandum. Nothing should be rashly changed.

Sicut natura nil facit per saltum, ita nec lex. As nature does nothing by a bound or leap, so neither does the law.

Verba nihil operandi melius est quam absurde. It is better that words should have no operation, than to operate absurdly.

The perplexing nature of Section 1 of the 14th Amendment resolves when one discovers that less than two years earlier, Congress—on June 30, 1864, in what is likely the most sweeping but effortless stratagem¹⁴ in history, before or since, evidently for the purpose of nullifying the unalienable Rights enshrined in the Declaration of Independence and circumventing, evading, and defeating the jurisdictional “chains of the Constitution” by which they are bound—strip the word “state” of its popular and ordinary meaning, as understood by all Americans and used in all legislative instruments since and including July 4, 1776, and convert it into a specialized term and define it to mean the same thing as its constitutional and statutory opposite, i.e., one of the territories or the District of Columbia; *to wit, in pertinent part*:

SEC. 182. *And be it further enacted*, That wherever the word state is used in this act it shall be construed to include the territories and the District of Columbia . . .¹⁵

¹⁴stratagem . . . 1 a : an artifice or trick in war for deceiving and outwitting the enemy b : a cleverly contrived trick or scheme for gaining an end . . . Merriam-Webster’s Unabridged Dictionary, inc. version 2.5, s.v. “Stratagem.”

¹⁵“An Act to provide Internal Revenue to support the Government, to pay Interest on the Public Debt, and for other Purposes,” Ch. 173, Sec. 182, 13 Stat. 223, 306, June 30, 1864.

Because “the territories and the District of Columbia” is not followed by general words, the rule of statutory interpretation known as *expressio unius est exclusio alterius* (“the inclusion of the one is the exclusion of the other”) tells us that the list of items is exhaustive as given; *to wit*:

§ 47:23 Expressio unius est exclusio alterius

As the maxim is applied to statutory interpretation, where . . . the persons or things to which it refers are designated, there is an inference that all omissions should be understood as exclusions. The maxim does not apply to every statutory listing or grouping. It has force only when the items expressed are members of an associated group or series, justifying the inference that the items not mentioned were excluded by deliberate choice.¹⁶ [Emphasis added.]

For example, “weekends and public holidays” excludes ordinary weekdays.¹⁷

The associated group of which “the territories and the District of Columbia” are members is properties other than Places purchased for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenal, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings, over which Congress exercise exclusive territorial jurisdiction. Wherefore, the full extent of the said associated group, as of June 30, 1864, is:

(1) the District of Columbia, (2) Arizona Territory, (3) Colorado Territory, (4) Dakota Territory, (5) Indian (Oklahoma) Territory, (6) Montana Territory, (7) Nebraska Territory, (8) Nevada Territory, (9) New Mexico Territory, (10) Utah Territory, and (11) Washington Territory and no other thing.

The relevant rules of statutory interpretation pertaining to language such as that used in Section 182 of the said Act, agree with the 11 maxims of law cited above and reveal that the departure from the ordinary and popular meaning of “state” is destructive of the subject matter and therefore inapposite¹⁸ and unwarranted; *to wit, in pertinent part*:

The words of a statute are to be construed with reference to its subject matter. If they are susceptible to several meanings, that one is to be adopted that best accords with the subject to which the statute relates. . . .¹⁹

The words of a statute are to be taken in their ordinary and popular meaning, unless they are technical terms or words of art, in which case they are to be understood in their technical sense. . . .²⁰

Wherefore, the new meaning embraces only the above 11 de facto (illegitimate) “states” and excludes the 36 de jure (by right) States of the Union. The only ones aware of this new “reality,” however, are the quislings²¹ in Congress (of whom, in 1864, there is a solid majority) who enact this legislation and their network of handlers.

The American People, pitted against each other in what is called, ironically, the *War Between the States*, are not aware of Congress’ alchemical transmutation (in the 182nd of 182 sections, on the 84th page of an 84-page statute) of territories-into-states; and can be predicted to believe or claim—erroneously—that they reside in a “state,” i.e., one of the associated group of properties other than Places purchased for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenal, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings, over which Congress exercise exclusive territorial jurisdiction.

¹⁶Norman J. Singer and J.D. Shambie Singer, *Statutes and Statutory Construction*, 7th ed., 2007 new ed., vol. 2A, Thomson – West, 398–412. [Extensive footnoting of Federal and State cases in Singers omitted here.]

¹⁷*A Dictionary of Law*, 5th ed., Elizabeth A. Martin, ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), s.v. “Interpretation of statutes.”

¹⁸*inapposite* . . . not apposite : not pertinent *Merriam-Webster’s Unabridged Dictionary*, inc. version 2.5, s.v. “Inapposite.”

¹⁹Henry Campbell Black, *Handbook on the Construction and Interpretation of the Laws* (St. Paul, Minn.: West Publishing Co., 1896), § 56, 125.

²⁰*Ibid*, § 57, 128.

²¹*quisling* . . . a traitorous national who aids the invader of his country and often serves as chief agent or puppet governor *Merriam-Webster’s Unabridged Dictionary*, inc. version 2.5, s.v. “Quisling.”

The Act of June 30, 1864, operates to subvert the entire body of constitutional jurisprudence in perpetuity.

Lex est ratio summa, quæ jubet quæ sunt utilia et necessaria, et contraria prohibet. Law is the perfection of reason, which commands what is useful and necessary and forbids the contrary.

Nihil quod est contra rationem est licitum. Nothing against reason is lawful.

Intentio inservire debet legibus, non leges intentioni. Intentions ought to be subservient to the laws, not the laws to intentions.

Rerum ordo confunditur, si unicuique jurisdictio non servatur. The order of things is confounded if every one preserves not his jurisdiction.

Whereas, there is no ambiguity in the words of the Constitution re jurisdiction and the meaning of “state,” no exposition to the contrary, such as that in Section 182 of the Act of June 30, 1864, and Section 1 of the 14th Amendment, can be justified.

The absurdity of said Section 182 is a violation of both letter and spirit of the Declaration of Independence and Constitution and a breach of the equitable duty, trust, and confidence reposed in Congress by the sovereign creators of the United States of America, as well as good conscience, operates to the injury of the American People, and therefore constitutes *constructive fraud*²² (included in law dictionaries no later than 1856, omitted no sooner than 1999²³).

Congress, via the ruse of June 30, 1864, effectively commandeered, with malice aforethought, under color of law,²⁴ via intentional production of confusion in the public mind as to the meaning of that certain novel term of art, “state,” extra-constitutional geographical territory over which to exercise absolute exclusive personal legislative power and jurisdiction over the American People, and set about to extort from said sovereigns, as revealed in the title of said Act, “*Internal Revenue to support the Government, [and] to pay Interest on the Public Debt,*” for the aggrandizement, as we shall see, of foreign bankers.

²²FRAUD. Fraud consists of some deceitful practice or willful device, resorted to with intent to deprive another of his right, or in some manner to do him an injury. As distinguished from negligence it is always positive, intentional. . . . Constructive fraud consists in any act of commission or omission contrary to legal or equitable duty, trust, or confidence justly reposed, which is contrary to good conscience and operates to the injury of another. . . . [Emphasis added.] *Black’s Law Dictionary*, 1st–6th eds. (only), s.v. “Fraud.”

²³Those who own and control the worldwide legal system (e.g., King Henry II of England monopolizes the practice of law in 1178 A.D. [Wade F. Baker, “Benchmarks For Your Practice,” *Journal of the Missouri Bar*, July–August 1976, 271] as a *property right*, conferred by *letters patent* by the king [Frederick Pollock and Frederic Maitland, *The History of English Law Before the Time of Edward I*, vol. 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1895), 191]; in America by the chief justice of each state’s supreme court and known as the *certificate of admission* [*Unger v. Landlords’ Management Corp.*, 114 N.J. Eq. 68, 168 A. 229 (Ch.1933)] continuously seek to marginalize or foreclose from understanding the modern student through numerous devices, primary among which is incessant modification, alteration, and revision of the content of law dictionaries, so each subsequent edition has more entries than the previous and the definition of particular words and legal terms, though technically true to the letter of the respective original, is in such a generalized, extrapolated, or abbreviated form that it effectively bars erudition. The clause discussing *constructive fraud* in n. 22, *supra*, is an example of this practice, in that the true meaning and import of the term cannot be ascertained from the most recent editions (7th and 8th) of the same law dictionary.

²⁴COLOR OF LAW. The appearance or semblance, without the substance, of legal right. *Ibid*, 2nd ed., s.v. “Color of law.”

As of 10 years thence, in the *Revised Statutes of the United States . . . 1873–’74*, Congress revise “state” to “State” (and “territories” to “Territories”), but otherwise retain the same language; *to wit*, in *pertinent part*:

SEC. 3140. The word “State,” when used in this Title, shall be construed to include the Territories and the District of Columbia . . .²⁵

Civil Rights Act of 1866: Fingerprints a positive match.

Once a fraud, always a fraud.²⁶

Fraus est celare fraudem. It is a fraud to conceal a fraud.

Uno absurdo dato, infinita sequuntur. One absurdity being allowed, an infinity follow.

The Civil Rights Act of April 9, 1866, follows on the heels of the Act of June 30, 1864, and the new term “state.” Notwithstanding that the Constitution authorizes Congress to exercise territorial and personal legislative power only in territories/places/property belonging to the United States (Articles 1 § 8(17) and 4 § 3(2)), said Civil Rights Act rather implies territorial and personal legislative jurisdiction over each and every “State” and the *persons* therein; *to wit*:

Be it enacted . . . That all persons born in the United States . . . are hereby declared to be citizens of the United States; and such citizens . . . shall have the same right, in every State and Territory in the United States . . .

Sec. 2. *And be it further enacted*, That any person who . . . shall subject, or cause to be subjected, any inhabitant of any State or Territory to the deprivation of any right secured or protected by this act . . .²⁷ [U/L emphasis added.]

There are only two ways to interpret Congress’ use of “State” in the said Act:

1. Implied breach of jurisdictional limits established in the Declaration of Independence and venerated in the Constitution—an act of High Treason; or
2. Use of the new “legal” definition and meaning of “state” from Section 182 of the Act of June 30, 1864, *only capitalized*—an act of constructive fraud.

“*Fides servanda. Good faith must be observed.*” Wherefore, the correct interpretation is 2. This choice is supported by the fact that the Act treats of “State” and “Territory” as geographical equivalents in their relation to “United States,” which usage comports with the meaning of “state” as defined in Section 182 of the Act of June 30, 1864, and also reveals that Congress’ use of “United States” means the collective of the 11 de facto “States,” i.e., the territories and District of Columbia, not the 36 de jure constituents of the Union.

Congress are no less guilty of the same constructive fraud (*supra*, n. 22) of the Act of June 30, 1864, in enacting the Civil Rights Act of April 9, 1866 (couched in terms that will be used in the 14th Amendment two months later), an event long-before predicted and accorded its own maxim of law; *to wit*: **Once a fraud, always a fraud** (*infra*, n. 26).

²⁵*Revised Statutes of the United States, Passed at the First Session of the Forty-third Congress, 1873–’74*, Title XXXV, Internal Revenue, Ch. 1, Officers of Internal Revenue, p. 601, approved retroactively as of the Act of March 2, 1877, amended and approved as of the Act of March 9, 1878.

²⁶*Bouvier’s Law Dictionary*, 3rd rev., 8th ed., s.v. “Maxim.”

²⁷“An Act to protect all Persons in the United States in their Civil Rights, and furnish the Means of their Vindication,” Ch. 31, §§ 1–2, 14 Stat. 27, April 9, 1866.

The 14th Amendment is a Trojan horse because it appears benign but operates to undermine organic law; i.e., to obtain in every “State,” throughout the “United States,” over “citizens of the United States.” **The lack of constitutional authority to exercise territorial legislative power anywhere in the Union, or personal legislative power over any of the sovereign American People who reside there, is conclusive proof that (1) Congress are using the new definition of “state” in the 14th Amendment, and (2) all Supreme Court Justices are complicit in the same constructive fraud and High Treason for permitting a false constitutional amendment.** Such is the magnitude of power of those in control of Congress and the judiciary (revealed *infra*).

The perpetrators must, perforce, disclose to the victims all components of the con—and do so, though as cryptically as possible—to ensure that the *servitude* of the American People remains “voluntary,” lest tyranny invoke the natural forces and processes that it is wont to do. The perpetrators play by the rules; they just do not want anyone else to know what they are. It is this feature, nonetheless, that allows us to get to the bottom of things and remedy the situation.

Congress commit the same constructive fraud as that of the Civil Rights Act April 9, 1866, as well as High Treason, in passing the 14th Amendment June 13, 1866, and all other legislative acts thereafter; a conclusion borne out in fact, increasingly so, as documented herein, to the present day; and adopt and employ policies of *obscurantism* and *insidious incrementalism*, through wholesale application of *pleonasm* and *tautology* (defined *infra*) in all official banking, corporate, and State and Federal governmental, legal, and tax-agency utterances of any kind whatsoever, so as to conceal the fraud; and embark on a strategic plan to lure the sovereign American People into a contractual relationship with government that justifies a **presumption of legal residence in the District of Columbia**, for the same purposes stated in the title of the original Act of June 30, 1864, i.e., “to provide Internal Revenue to support the Government, [and] to pay Interest on the Public Debt”; to wit, in pertinent part:

ob-scu-rant-ism . . . *n.* 1. Opposition to the increase and spread of knowledge. 2. Deliberate obscurity or evasion of clarity. [*Random House Dictionary*, coll. ed., s.v. “Obscurantism”]

insidious . . . acting by imperceptible degrees : having a gradual, cumulative, and usually hidden effect [*Merriam-Webster’s Unabridged Dictionary*, inc. version 2.5, s.v. “Insidious”]

incrementalism . . . a policy or advocacy of a policy of political or social change in small increments [*Ibid*, s.v. “Incrementalism”]

ple-o-nasm . . . *Rhet.* The use of more words than are needed for the full expression of a thought; redundancy, as in saying “the very identical thing itself” . . . a violation of grammatical precision. . . . [*Funk & Wagnalls Dictionary*, 1903 ed., s.v. “Pleonasm”]

tau-tol’o-gy . . . *Rhet.* That form of pleonasm in which the same word or idea is unnecessarily repeated; unnecessary repetition, whether in word or sense . . . [*Ibid*, s.v. “Tautology”]

There is one other thing that the Act of June 30, 1864, and 14th Amendment have in common: provision for the *public debt* (found in the title of the former, in Section 4 of the latter).

The other reason for the 14th Amendment.

Clausula quæ abrogationem excludit ab initio non valet. A clause in a law which precludes its abrogation, is invalid from the beginning.

Perpetua lex est, nullam legem humanum ac positivam perpetuam esse; et clausula quæ abrogationem excludit initio non valet. It is a perpetual law that no human or positive law can be perpetual; and a clause in a law which precludes the power of abrogation is void ab initio.

In commodo hæc pactio, ne dolus præstetur, rata non est. If in a contract for a loan there is inserted a clause that the borrower shall not be answerable for fraud, such clause is void.

Non impedit clausula derogatoria, quo minus ab eadem potestate res dissolvantur a qua constituuntur. A derogatory clause does not prevent things from being dissolved by the same power by which they were originally made.

Intentio inservire debet legibus, non leges intentioni. Intentions ought to be subservient to the laws, not the laws to intentions.

Quod initio vitiosum est, non potest tractu temporis convalescere. Time cannot render valid an act void in its origin.

Congress' corruption of the meaning of "state" in 1864 (then "State" in the *Revised Statutes*) is the first and principal step in overcoming lack of authority to impose a personal income tax on the American People (sovereigns and nontaxpayers). The novel "citizen of the United States" named in Section 1 of the 14th Amendment—destined ultimately for enshrinement as that certain *person* and *United States Government employee* defined as the "individual"²⁸—appears to refer to the Union, but in reality only the new "States," the territories and District of Columbia, as authorized in Articles 1 § 8(17) and 4 § 3(2) of the Constitution, which are foreign to the Union.

Section 4 of the 14th Amendment dovetails with Section 1 in that it purports to shield from scrutiny the so-called *public debt*, linchpin²⁹ of the future Federal Reserve *fractional-reserve-banking* scheme (detailed *infra*) and "legal" justification for income tax; *to wit, in pertinent part*:

The validity of the public debt of the United States . . . shall not be questioned. [14th Amendment § 4]

Public debt. That which is due or owing by the government of a state or nation.³⁰

Investigation reveals (1) the primary method used over the last 319 years to create public debt is known as "fractional-reserve lending," (2) the principal amount of the public debt so created is never to be paid down (*infra*, nn. 31, 68–69), and (3) the interest upon which public debt is to be paid by the public—in America, by the so-called "citizen of the United States" (the object of the definition of the term "individual"; itself, in turn, the object of the definition of the term "person"), each his "fair share," in the form of taxes, primarily income tax; *to wit*:

National debt. The money owing by government . . . the interest of which is paid out of the taxes raised by the whole of the public . . .³¹ [Emphasis added.]

Examination of the attempt to conceal the nature of the public debt by "official decree" in Section 4 of the 14th Amendment reveals the source of all governmental anomalies in the American Republic since *The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America* of July 4, 1776 (only foundational congressional instrument devoid of fatal flaw).

²⁸the term "individual" means a citizen of the United States or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence. United States Code Title 5 *Government Organization and Employees* § 552a(a)(2).

²⁹linchpin . . . a pin inserted in the axletree outside of the wheel to prevent the latter from slipping off . . . something that serves to hold together the elements of a situation *Merriam-Webster's Unabridged Dictionary*, inc. version 2.5, s.v. "Linchpin."

³⁰*Black's Law Dictionary*, 5th ed., s.v. "Debt."

³¹*Ibid*, s.v. "National debt." [Note: There is no provision in the Federal Reserve Act of December 23, 1913, requiring repayment of the principal amount of any loan taken by the United States Government.]

Nature and origin of “fractional-reserve banking”.

The intellectual faculties, however, are not of themselves sufficient: to produce external action they require the aid of physical force, the direction and combination of which are wholly at the disposal of money; that mighty spring by which the whole machinery of human energies is set in motion.³²

Augustus Boeckh, 1817.

The lending scheme of the Federal Reserve Act, known as *fractional-reserve banking* or *lending* (not defined in law dictionaries) consists in the creation of fictitious “deposits” of digits, called “credit,” typed into the accounts of borrowers, in multiples (set at 9X) of actual funds (gold or government promissory notes) on deposit at a central bank, the so-called reserve funds, which comprise only a fraction (1/10) of the total on reserve and “loaned.” The scheme is dependent on (1) a central bank and government-enforced monopoly to bar competing non-member banks, and (2) public confidence in the currency. As explained by essayists at the private Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago (documented *infra*), this practice traces to goldsmiths; *to wit*:

It started with goldsmiths. As early bankers, they initially provided safekeeping services, making a profit from vault storage fees for gold and coins deposited with them. People would redeem their “deposit receipts” whenever they needed gold or coins to purchase something, and physically take the gold or coins to the seller, who, in turn, would deposit them for safekeeping, often with the same banker. Everyone soon found out that it was a lot easier simply to use the deposit receipts directly as a means of payment. These receipts, which became known as notes [³³] were acceptable as money [³⁴] since whoever held them could go to the banker and exchange them for metallic money.

Then, bankers discovered that they could make loans merely by giving away their promises to pay, or bank notes, to borrowers. In this way banks began to create money. More notes could be issued than the gold and coin on hand because only a portion of the notes outstanding would be presented for payment at any one time. . . .³⁵

No matter how seemingly innocent, the above account is at once a confession of magnitude and blueprint of the history of the world. The merchant described therein, whose *modus operandi* in remote antiquity endures all the generations and persists in his progeny yet today, is considered by all cultures (other than his own) to be the most pernicious of all the occupations of man; whose customs of “*money creation*” and *usury* (defined *infra*) are among the most heinous of crimes that one can commit against his fellows and are to be found, almost without exception, at the bottom of every significant international conflict and national revolution and economic collapse for the last many thousands of years³⁶; which “customs,” evidently, are so disastrous to any and all upon whom a goldsmith-banker visits these two particular aspects of his “craft” as to require, for the preservation of the family, clan, tribe, community, nation, or race itself, until only a few hundred years ago, that the goldsmith be put to death; *to wit* (*Emphasis added in all citations.*):

³² August Boeckh, *The Public Economy of Athens*, rev. 2nd ed., trans. George Lewis (London: John W. Parker, West Strand, 1842), bk. 1, 1–2.

³³ I.e., *promissory* notes, whereby the goldsmith-banker signed an unconditional promise to pay a sum certain in *money*, i.e., precious-metal coin, on demand.

³⁴ MONEY. Gold and silver coins. The common medium of exchange in a civilized nation. . . . *Bouvier’s Law Dictionary*, 3rd rev., 8th ed., s.v. “Money.”

³⁵ *Modern Money Mechanics: A Workbook on Bank Reserves and Deposit Expansion*, Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, 1994, 3.

³⁶ Richard Kelly Hoskins, *War Cycles / Peace Cycles* (Lynchburg, Va.: Virginia Publishing Co., 1985).

But the king shall cause a goldsmith who behaves dishonestly, the most nocuous [³⁷] of all the thorns, to be cut to pieces with razors.³⁸ [*The Laws of Manu* (Hindu progenitor of mankind, king, lawgiver)]

If I say to the wicked, “You shall surely die,” and you give him no warning, nor speak to warn the wicked from his wicked way, in order to save his life, that wicked person shall die for his iniquity, but his blood I will require at your hand. [Ezekiel, 3:18]

Hath given forth upon usury, and hath taken increase: shall he then live? he shall not live: he hath done all these abominations; he shall surely die; his blood shall be upon him. [Ibid, 18:8–13]

Those who earn from usury stand only like one who is struck by the devil’s touch. That is because they claim that usury is a form of trade. But God permits trade, and prohibits usury. Whoever heeds this admonition from his lord, and abstains from usury, may keep his past earnings, and his judgment rests with God. As for those who return to usury, they will deserve hell, wherein they abide forever. [*Quran*, Surah al-Baqarah 2:275]

O you who believe, beware of God, and give up the usury that is outstanding, if you are really believers. If you do not refrain, then expect a war from God and His messenger. But if you repent, then you may keep your principal, without inflicting injustice, or suffering injustice. [Ibid, 2:278–279]

Only recently is mankind more “civilized” and “tolerant” of the ways of the goldsmith-bankers; *to wit*: Concomitant with certain anomalous and esoteric fraternal, social, religious, political, philosophical, and literary events leading up to and including the so-called Protestant Reformation in the 16th century, the definition of “usury” changes from “lending at interest” to “lending above the rate of interest allowed by law” and the former traditional penalty for its practice (death) unofficially discontinued. “Usury” is defined now, in pertinent part, as follows:

u’su-ry . . . Originally the act or practice of loaning money at interest, or of taking interest for money so loaned; now archaic except in the sense of exorbitant or extortionate interest, specifically (*Law*), the demanding and taking, or contracting to receive, for the use of money as a loan, a rate of interest beyond what is allowed by law.

Neither shalt thou lay upon him *usury*. Ex. xxii, 25.

The curse of *usury*, which always falls so heavily upon new settlements, did not spare them; . . . they were obliged to borrow money at fifty per cent and at thirty per cent interest. BANCROFT *United States* vol. i chap. 8, p. 250. [L. B. & CO. ’76] . . . [*Funk & Wagnalls Dictionary*, 1903 ed., s.v. “Usury”]

Lex non cogit impossibilia. The law requires nothing impossible.

Nemo tenetur ad impossibile. No one is bound to an impossibility.

Usury is a contract.

If one lends \$10, and it is the only \$10 in existence, on the condition that he be repaid \$11; and if the borrower agrees to repay \$11 when only \$10 exists, he has agreed to an impossible contract. It is the traditional fraudulent usury contract.³⁹

Richard Kelly Hoskins, 1990.

³⁷nocuous . . . likely to cause injury : HARMFUL, DAMAGING . . . *Merriam-Webster’s Unabridged Dictionary*, inc. version 2.5, s.v. “Nocuous.”

³⁸*The Laws of Manu: The Sacred Books of the East*, vol. XXV, George Bühler, trans., Max Müller, ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1886), ch. IX, v. 292, p. 394.

³⁹Richard Kelly Hoskins, *Vigilantes of Christendom: The History of the Phineas Priesthood* (Lynchburg, Va.: Virginia Publishing Company, 1990), 184.

Whereas, the Torah (Record of the Bull⁴⁰), i.e., the first five books of the Old Testament, forbids usury amongst “brothers,” the same with “strangers” is encouraged; *to wit*:

Thou shalt not lend upon usury to thy brother; usury of money, usury of victuals, usury of any thing that is lent upon usury: *Unto a stranger thou mayest lend upon usury*; but unto thy brother thou shalt not lend upon usury: *that the LORD thy God may bless thee in all that thou settest thine hand to in the land whither thou goest to possess it.* [Emphasis added.] [Deuteronomy 23:19–20]

The intrigues of goldsmith-bankers comprehend all epochs of history, including the present, and the value of knowledge thereof, in terms of survival of the species, is inestimable; *to wit*:

However it is clear that with the growth of silver in circulation between private persons, and between private persons and states, as now would become an inevitability, that which had been total economic control from the gods through his servants in the Ziggurat, was bypassed, and merchants were now able to deal privately using their own credit, or powers of abstract money creation. They were also able, through their control of distant mining operations, to afflict a previously dedicated priesthood with thought of personal possession; and through the control of the manufacture of weapons in distant places, they were able to arm warlike peoples towards the destruction of whosoever they might choose.

Those merchants of whatever race they may have been, who voyaged to the cities of Sumeria from places as far distant as the great cities of the Indus valley civilization known today as Mohenjo-Daro and Harrapa, as is clearly demonstrated by the Sumerian seals found at Mohenjo-Daro⁴¹ and the seals from Mohenjo-Daro found at Ur,⁴² and who were without a doubt one of the main sources of precious metal supply in Sumeria,⁴³ came to realize that they could actually create that which functioned as money with but the record incised by the stylus on the clay tablet promising metal or money. Obviously, as a result of this discovery which depended on the confidence they were able to create in the minds of the peoples of their integrity, provided they banded themselves together with an absolute secrecy that excluded all other than their proven and chosen brethren, they could replace the god of the city himself as the giver of all. If so be they could institute a conception of a one god, *their* god, a special god of the world, a god above all gods, then not merely the city, be it Ur or Kish or Lagash or Uruk, but the world itself could be theirs, and all that in it was... [sic] A strange dream! One whose fulfillment they never really expected!

Some evidence of the knowledge and previous existence of such practice of issuance of false receipts as against supposed valuables on deposit for safe-keeping clearly exists in the Law No. 7 of the great Hammurabai, which same law was undoubtedly intended as a preventative to this sickness in society, which, even at that day, may very well have been the cancer that destroyed much that has been before.

According to Professor Bright, the Code of Hammurabai was but a revision of two legal codes promulgated in Sumerian by Lipit-Ishtar of Isin, and in Akkadian by the King of Eshnummua during the period of the breakup of that power formerly wielded by the God at Ur, that is, at about the same time that Ur was sacked by the Elamites in 1950 B.C., and Amorite and Elamite political power was established over Northern and Southern Mesopotamia.⁴⁴ Both of these codes are well before the Code of Hammurabai, and are evidence of the latter being but a revision of law codes existing in the days of UR-NAMMU, or before, UR-NAMMU being that most outstanding ruler who reigned from 2278 B.C. to 2260 B.C. during the third dynasty at Ur.⁴⁵

⁴⁰Gene D. Matlock, *Jesus and Moses are Buried in India, Birthplace of Abraham and the Hebrews!* (New York: Authors Choice Press, 2000), 254.

⁴¹E.J.C. McKay, *Further Excavations at Mohenjo-Daro* (Delhi: Govt. India, 1938), 582, cited in Astle, 7.

⁴²Sir Charles L. Woolley: *Excavations at Ur* (London, 1954), 112, *ibid*.

⁴³In the words of Sir Charles L. Woolley on page 193 of *Excavations at Ur*:

“Raw materials were imported, sometimes from over the sea, to be worked up in the Ur factories; the Bill of Lading of a merchant ship which came up the canal from the Persian Gulf to discharge its cargo on the wharves of Ur details gold, copper ore . . . ivory, pearls, and precious stones.” Quoted in Astle, 7.

⁴⁴John Bright, *A History of Israel* (London, 1960), 44, cited in Astle, 8.

⁴⁵Sir Charles Leonard Woolley; *The Sumerians* (New York, 1965), 25, *ibid*.

The severity of the penalty and the placing of the law so high in the code leaves little doubt that it was directed against an evil that was by no means new, and, who knows, may have been one of the deep seated causes of the invasions that devastated Ur, both from the Gutim,⁴⁶ the Elamites, the Amorites, and the Hittites; for no doubt of old, just as today, Money Power was as busy arming the enemies of the people amongst whom it sojourned, as that people themselves.

While the scholars do not appear to have paid any special attention to this particular law, or to have attached to it any special significance, its true intent and purpose is clear to anyone conversant with the origins of private money issuance in modern times, as indicated by the familiar story of the goldsmith's multiple receipts...⁴⁷ [sic]

*If a man buys silver or gold or slave, or slave girl, or ox or sheep or ass or anything else whatsoever from a [free] man's son or a free man's slave or has received them for safe custody without witness or contract, that man is a thief: he shall be put to death.*⁴⁸

The requisite of witnesses and contract attesting to the true facts of valuables on deposit, would to some extent obviate the danger of the goldsmiths, silversmiths or traders, involved in a transaction, creating receipts for valuables that did not exist, in safe custody or otherwise. It was equally possible in ancient times as much as in modern times to circulate such receipts as money lawfully instituted.

Provided a corrupted priesthood . . . loaned their sanction thereto, such fraudulent money or, in the misleading euphemism of a corrupted world, "credit," would be equally effective in foreign markets as in the home markets, if not more so because of the greater danger of exposure of the criminal nature of this activity that would undoubtedly exist in the home market.

The severity of the penalty required by this Law Number 7 of the Code of Hammurabai, exercised by a strong and dedicated ruler, would have been an absolute deterrent to such practice that since that time, and more especially in modern times since the 16th Century A.D., has become so indurated to a fixture... [sic] Its results are to be seen on every hand, not to speak of the final result which though not yet arrived, else this book would not be in existence, is clear.

The Laws of Hammurabai, King of Babylon, just the same as those more ancient codes of which they were revision, were directed towards the regulation of life of nobleman, as well as freeman, merchant, or slave, and no special concessions were given to either of these stations in life, even if such stations in life were accepted as integral part of the structure of the state life. Euphemistic and misleading words such as "businessman" or "financier" had not yet, it seems, been planted in the vocabulary. By and large, the king still ruled in absolute, and his law giving justice to all was carved in stone, and placed in the market place for the highest or the lowest to understand clearly the rules by which he must live... [sic] Merchants were unequivocally described as such, and law ruthlessly prescribed severe penalties for their corrupt conduct. . . .

The Code of Hammurabai, revision of more ancient codes as it was, does not reveal any particular regard towards this caste of persons. However, as by the time of its promulgation, both private property and privately issued money seem to have been well established, it is to be assumed that the ignorant of noble caste or otherwise, were already deferring to that magic known as money, in much the same manner as they did at all times through latter history when faced with the necessity of compromise with private money creative power, whose activities had been permitted by foolish kings, and to whom such kings had even committed the finances of the realm. Such was most clearly illustrated during the last four hundred years in England; perhaps more so than at any other time in recorded history.

In the time of Hammurabai, King of Babylon, matters were by no means as desperate as they are today. Merchandising was by no means regarded as an end in itself, and a means whereby it was the right of ignoble men to proffer any corruption to the people so long as it made "profit" for them, and "interest" for the so-called banker who supplied the original "finances" out of his secret and costless money-creative processes. Money lending and merchandising as it is known, still had not come to be

⁴⁶The Goyim of Genesis; Chapter XIV, verse I, cited in Astle, 8.

⁴⁷A. Andréadès, *History of the Bank of England 1640 to 1903*, 4th ed. (reprint), trans. Christabel Meredith (London: Frank Cass & Co., Ltd., 1966), 23, *ibid*.

⁴⁸*The Laws of Hammurabai*; No. 7 (G.R. Driver and John C. Miles, *Ancient Codes and Laws of the Near East*, Vol. II (Oxford, 1952), 15, quoted in Astle, 9.

a means whereby man-hating and therefore corrupt secret societies might seek to overturn the tree of life itself by way of sowing the seeds of decay in that true and natural order of life which had been ordained from time immemorial.⁴⁹ [U/L emphasis added.]

Goldsmith-bankers of the private Bank of Amsterdam undertake to usurp control of the British throne.

To realize the spoils of fractional-reserve lending but avert violent retaliation from defrauded “customers” (enemies in war), certain goldsmith-bankers, principals of the private Bank of Amsterdam (parent bank of the future private Bank of England⁵⁰), in 1622 devise, for the first time, but fail in their efforts to get the Dutch government to institute, the commercial artifice that will come to be known as *income tax*.⁵¹

Seemingly guided by their LORD (Deut. 23:19–20, *supra*, p. 16), said goldsmiths and bullion brokers undertake a strategic plan “*to lend upon usury to strangers in the land whither thou goest*” to secure hegemonic control of the British throne and establish (1) a new private bank, (2) fractional-reserve lending (*infra*, nn. 66–68), and (3) a permanent public debt (*infra*, n. 69), interest upon which to be paid out of taxes levied (seized) from the English people; *to wit*:

More than ample evidence exists of those persons designated international bankers in “Modern Times” as also the instigative factor in the principle [sic] so-called revolutions of the last three hundred years. According to Commander Guy Carr,⁵² the so-called English revolution was totally the work of the international bullion brokers who seem at that time to have been lodged in Amsterdam . . .

Some of the Crypto-Jews of the Commonwealth,⁵³ of whom many would have been in England during the reign of Charles I, would also appear to have been a factor in such revolution as witting or unwitting agents of the Amsterdam bullion brokers. . . .⁵⁴ [sic] The main designer of the events of those days seems to have been a Manasseh Ben Israel, “a remarkable character,” who apparently took the initiative in the financing of Cromwell;⁵⁵ which enabled Cromwell to obtain the best of arms, the first requisite of the would-be conqueror throughout history. . . .⁵⁶

To return to Cromwell . . . and his assumption of the powers of tyranny: when it became clear that Cromwell was as “suitable” a man as could be found to fit the needs of the occasion, Manasseh Ben Israel supplied him with the gifted Fernandez Carvajal, for the reorganization of his army, which became known as the “Model Army”. Trained revolutionaries then poured into the country, presiding over whom was the Portuguese Ambassador, a De Souza, who loaned them the diplomatic immunity of his house for their meetings. One such revolutionary was the man known today as Calvin, whose father had been fiscal agent to a prominent French Bishop.⁵⁷

These revolutionary leaders, besides developing the technique of spreading religious differences, also exploited the use of truculent mobs, a practice known to this class of people from most ancient times, for the gaining of political ends. According to Commander Guy Carr, who is a relatively recent writer on this subject:⁵⁸ [sic] “The evidence which absolutely convicts Oliver Cromwell of participating in the revolutionary plot was obtained by Lord Alfred Douglas, who edited a weekly review known as

⁴⁹David Astle, *The Babylonian Woe: A study of the Origin of Certain Banking Practices, and of their effect on the events of Ancient History, written in the light of the Present Day* (Toronto: Published privately, 1975), 7–10.

⁵⁰*Ibid.*, 114.

⁵¹J. De Vries and A. Van der Woude, *The First Modern Economy: Success, Failure, and Perseverance of the Dutch Economy, 1500–1815*, 107. [Personal income tax would arrive in England in 1799, *infra*, n. 123.]

⁵²William Guy Carr, *Pawns in the Game* (Hawthorne, Ca.: Omni Publications, 1955), 19–21, cited in Astle, 114.

⁵³Lucien Wolf, *The Resettlement of the Jews in England: A Paper Read before the Jews' College Literary Society, November 27th, 1887* (London: Jewish Chronicle, 1888), *Ibid*, 115.

⁵⁴Andréadès, *History of the Bank of England*, 28, *ibid*.

⁵⁵F.P.G. Guizot, *Histoire de la Revolution d'Angleterre* (Paris, 1854), 154–155, *ibid*.

⁵⁶Astle, 114–115.

⁵⁷Will Durant, *The Story of Civilization*, vol. 6 (N.Y.: Simon & Schuster, 1957), 459, cited in Astle, 118.

⁵⁸Carr, *Pawns in the Game*, 20, *ibid*.

Plain English published by the North British Publishing Company. In an article which appeared in the issue of Sept. 3rd 1921, he explained that he and his friend, Mr. L.D. Van Valckert of Amsterdam, Holland, had come into possession of a missing volume of records of the Synagogue of Muljeim. This volume had been lost during the Napoleonic Wars. The volume contained records of letters written to and answered by the directors of the Synagogue.

They are written in German. One entry dated June 16th, 1647 reads: From O.C. (i.e.) Oliver Cromwell to Ebenezer Pratt.

‘In return for financial support will advocate admission... [sic] to England; this however impossible while Charles living. Charles cannot be executed without trial, adequate grounds for which do not at present exist. Therefore advise that Charles be assassinated, but will have nothing to do with the arrangements for procuring an assassin, though willing to help in his escape.’ [sic]

In reply to this dispatch the records show E. Pratt wrote a letter dated July 12th, 1647 addressed to Oliver Cromwell.

‘Will grant financial aid as soon as Charles removed and ... [sic] admitted.’⁵⁹ Assassination too dangerous. Charles should be given an opportunity to escape. His recapture will then make trial and execution possible. The support will be liberal but useless to discuss terms until trial commences.’

On November 12th, that same year, Charles was given the opportunity to escape. He was, of course, recaptured. Hollis and Ludlow, authorities on this chapter of history, are both on record as considering the flight as the stratagem of Cromwell. After Charles had been recaptured, events moved apace. Cromwell had the British Parliament purged of most of the members he knew were loyal to the King. Notwithstanding this drastic action, when the house sat all night on December 6th, 1648, the majority agreed ‘That the concessions offered by the king were satisfactory to a settlement.’

Any such settlement would have disqualified Cromwell from receiving the blood money promised him by the international money barons through their agent E. Pratt, so Cromwell struck again. He ordered Colonel Pryde to purge Parliament of those members who had voted in favour of a settlement with the King. What then happened is referred to in history books as ‘Pryde’s purge’. When the purge was finished, fifty members remained. They are recorded as the ‘Rump Parliament’. They usurped absolute power. On January 30th, 1649, he was publicly beheaded in front of the banqueting house at Whitehall, London ... Oliver [sic] Cromwell received his blood money just as Judas had done.’⁶⁰ [U/L emphasis added.] [Astle, 117–119]

Goldsmiths become “bankers”.

This capital, which they received at a very low rate, or even for nothing, they used for . . . loans at high rates. The profitable nature of these induced the goldsmiths to encourage the deposit of spare money with them by offering good interest and by allowing the depositors to withdraw their money without notice. This policy succeeded beyond all expectations, and in the course of a few years the citizens had generally adopted the habit of depositing their savings with the goldsmiths. . . .

Receipts were given for these deposits, which, under the title of goldsmiths' notes, soon circulated better than the actual coins whose scarcity they often supplied. Nor was this usage a temporary one, for . . . Davenant⁶¹ tells us that in the absence of coins, “All great dealings were transacted by tallies, bank bills, and goldsmiths’ notes.”

Goldsmiths notes must thus be regarded as the earliest form of bank-notes issued in England.

. . . “*And they then first came to be called Bankers.*”⁶² [Andréadès, 23–24]

⁵⁹According to A. Andréadès (*History of the Bank of England*, p. 30), Frederick Harrison says in his biography of Oliver Cromwell:

“Noble were the efforts of the Protector to impress his own spirit of toleration on the intolerance of his age. He effectively protected the Quakers; he admitted the Jews after an expulsion of three centuries, and he satisfied Mazarin that he had given to Catholics all the protection that he dared.” Quoted in Astle, 118.

⁶⁰Carr, *Pawns in the Game*, 19–21, cited in Astle, 119.

⁶¹Charles Davenant, *Discourses on the Public Revenues and Trade of England*, vol. II, Edit. Sir C. Whitworth (1698), 161, cited in Andréadès, 23.

⁶²Compare H. D. Macleod, *Theory and Practice of Banking*, 6th ed., 2 vols. (London, 1902), *op. cit.*, [sic] p. 367, quoted in Andréadès, 24.

Goldsmiths' agent founds the Bank of England;
William III sanctions fractional-reserve banking;
Parliament institute a permanent public debt.

The said goldsmith-bankers and bullion brokers evidently enlist the services of a former resident (1685–1689) of Amsterdam, Holland, a Scotchman by the name of William Paterson, who settles in London in 1689 and, *despite no prior experience in banking*, quickly becomes a rich and influential man; in 1691 proposes foundation of the Bank of England; in 1692 “falls in” with Charles Montagu, who becomes Lord of the Treasury; in 1694 pens “a pamphlet demonstrating the economic principles on which the future Bank of England was to rest”⁶³; and who, under the patronage of a foreign prince—in 1689 known as King William III of England and Ireland, but before this time William III of Orange of Holland—secures, on July 27, 1694, the Charter of Incorporation⁶⁴ of the private Bank of England⁶⁵; *to wit*:

William III of England, owing his throne to the intrigues of the international bullion brokers at Amsterdam, granted them as reward that which they wanted more than anything on earth, which was the establishment of the legality of an undeterminable amount of abstract money, ledger credit page entry, or paper notes, to be based on their gold loans to the state, and the creation of a “Bank” at London from which they might issue this money known as “Credit” as loan against real collateral throughout the whole kingdom. This bank was to be given the appearance of a state department. In this case such status was obtained by permitting it to be named: “The Bank of England.”⁶⁶

But let us coolly consider the principle involved in this plan of issuing notes upon the security of the public debts. Stated in simple language, it is this: That the way to CREATE money is for the Government to BORROW money. . . . [A]s a general principle, what can be more palpably absurd ? . . .⁶⁷
H. D. Macleod (economist, author), 1855.

The chief provisions of the act establishing the Bank of England are as follows:

For a (permanent) loan to the Government of £1,200,000 in money (specie: gold coin), which sum of capital is raised from private-party subscribers to the capital stock of a new corporation called “The Governor and Company of the Bank of England,” the Government agrees to interest at 8%, i.e., £96,000, plus managerial expenses of £4,000, a total of £100,000 per annum, and exempts from the usury laws and grants to the Bank the right to *circulate* (issue for use as currency) the Bank’s unconditional promises to pay money on demand, called *bank-notes* (bank promissory notes), up to the value of its capital, £1,200,000.⁶⁸

The riddle as to why the Bank would put itself in a position so as to (1) lose indefinitely the use of its capital (£1,200,000 in specie), and (2) invite bankruptcy for failing to honor and pay, in gold coin, demands for payment of its promissory notes (bank-notes), is solved within the following lines; *to wit*:

⁶³Andréadès, *History of the Bank of England*, 59–65. [“A Brief Account of the intended Bank of England”]

⁶⁴Ibid, 74.

⁶⁵Ibid, 402.

⁶⁶Andréadès, *History of the Bank of England*, 73, cited in Astle, *The Babylonian Woe*, 140.

⁶⁷H. D. Macleod, *Theory and Practice of Banking*, 6th ed., 416–417, quoted in Andréadès, 124. “[E]very loan made to the government was attended by an equivalent increase in the paper currency.” Macleod, cited *ibid*. This is an expansion of magnitude of the goldsmith’s creation of false “deposit receipts” for valuables that do not exist.

⁶⁸Andréadès, 65, 73, 124, 403.

Thus the loan from the Bank was the first permanent loan . . . in theory, since the Government reserved the right to pay it off . . . in fact, since everyone foresaw that the Government would never want to destroy an institution so useful to itself and to the public.

The capital of the Bank was thus in the hands of the Government.

In what way, then, could it make any profit?

. . . Besides the income of £100,000 paid to it yearly . . . the Bank had the power to issue notes.

It issued these to an amount equal to the sum advanced to the Government. . . .

It seems incredible that the Bank took no precaution to ensure the convertibility of its notes . . . It would not have succeeded in doing so had it not been for the sacrifices made by its directors and shareholders.⁶⁹ [Emphasis added.]

First of all, the reason the Bank—in actuality financed, owned, and run by goldsmiths of the private Bank of Amsterdam (*supra*, nn. 50, 54, 66)—is considered “so useful . . . to the public” is that it provides security against “unscrupulous goldsmiths” doing business in England (but in league with Manasseh Ben Israel, *supra*, n. 55, and Amsterdam goldsmith-bankers); *to wit*:

The advantages which the Bank afforded to the public were no less great. The citizens now had a place where their deposits would be in security,⁷⁰ and would bear interest although the money could be withdrawn at will.

The Bank was undoubtedly an immense benefit to both Government and public. [Andréadès, 88]

Michael Godfrey, the subject of footnote 70, *infra*, apparently serves the goldsmith-bankers of the Bank of Amsterdam as main shill and barker for the new bank in the City of London; and publicly rails against and condemns the frauds⁷¹ of local goldsmiths (strategic partners of the same Amsterdam goldsmiths and bullion brokers) and succeeds, based on his considerable influence, in causing many Londoners to turn to the new Bank for security of their valuables.⁷²

Secondly, the name “Bank of England” gives the Bank, though private, “the appearance of a state department” (*supra*, n. 66) and inspires confidence in holders of the Bank’s promissory notes that they can redeem them for specie whenever they like; the bank-notes, though not backed by money, nonetheless have *purchasing power* because they appear to represent money.

Lastly, and most significantly, the directors and shareholders of the Bank, which has no money with which to pay its promissory notes, are the very creators thereof and subscribers thereto and own (or control by proxy) a majority of subscriptions and are the wealthiest merchants⁷³ on the face of the earth, uniquely positioned to pay, without incident, the few of the Bank’s promissory notes that might require more money than the “dividends [interest payments] it received from Government” or “from the gains it made out of the notes which it put into circulation.”⁷⁴

Wherefore, as later concluded by Thorold Rogers, preeminent professor of economics at Oxford University, as to why the Bank would agree to such an arrangement:

It coined, in short, its own credit into paper money.⁷⁵

⁶⁹Andréadès, *History of the Bank of England*, 84–85.

⁷⁰“Godfrey takes the opportunity of making various accusations against the goldsmiths. See above, pp. 22 and 25.” Cited in Andréadès, 88.

⁷¹Debasement, clipping, falsification of coinage; lending at 33% when legal limit is 6%; encouraging deposit of specie in exchange for “deposit receipts”; amassing valuables in trade by creating and using “deposit receipts” for valuables that do not exist, then going bankrupt or fleeing the area with the valuables (Andréadès, 22–25), leaving holders of the goldsmith’s promises to pay money with nothing but broken promises; *to wit*:

According to Godfrey, two or three millions . . . had been lost through the bankruptcies of goldsmiths and the disappearance of their clerks. Andréadès, 24–25.

⁷²*Ibid*, 87.

⁷³“This bank was at the height of its glory when the Bank of England was founded. . . .” *Ibid*, 80.

According to Davenant, the Bank of Amsterdam held regularly £36,000,000. *Ibid*, 81, n. 2.

⁷⁴Thorold Rogers, *The First Nine Years of the Bank of England* (Oxford, 1887), 9, quoted in Andréadès, 82.

⁷⁵*Ibid*. [This fact portends military conquest, personal ownership, of the Earth by the goldsmith-bankers.]

William Paterson evidently is delighted with the goldsmith-bankers' private "money creation" (fractional-reserve banking) facility, but as seen below and further *infra*, his candor reveals an amateurishness and absence of the unyielding hatred required to deceive and defraud others of the means of survival (money) as a way of life. The scam is dependent on sufficient confidence in the convertibility of the false promissory notes among holders, that only a small percentage will demand payment; when too many do, it is called "bank failure." Paterson tries to sell the idea that the victims—not the perpetrators—of the grift will be the beneficiaries; *to wit*:

"[I]f the proprietors of the Bank can circulate their own *foundation* [funds, bank-notes] of twelve hundred thousand pounds [£1,200,000 of bank notes] without having more than two or three hundred thousand pounds lying dead [redeemed in gold] at one time with another, this Bank will be in effect as nine hundred thousand pounds or a million of fresh money brought into the nation."⁷⁶

Although the exact reason is unknown, "after a disagreement with his colleagues,"⁷⁷ Paterson, founder of the Bank of England, resigns and retires in 1695, only one year after its institution. In contradistinction to his former "prosperity" (after settling in London in 1689), he "[complains] of poverty unceasingly until the end of his life" and reportedly "[passes] the concluding years of his life in want."⁷⁸ Whereas, there may be other reasons for Paterson's departure from the Bank and subsequent financial misfortune, the most plausible is the likely reaction of his "colleagues" upon learning of his utterance of the following (which remark would not have gone unnoticed anywhere in England); *to wit*:

The bank hath benefit of the interest on all moneys which it creates out of nothing.⁷⁹

[A]lthough the goldsmiths introduced banking into England, they did not succeed in adequately fulfilling the functions of a genuine bank and had later on to give place to the Bank of England ; this institution supported as it was by the State, was able to avoid the mistakes of its predecessors.⁸⁰

Wherefore, the goldsmiths of the Bank of Amsterdam, courtesy of the "largesse" of their debtor-servant front man, the former Dutch prince, William III of Orange, now King of England,⁸¹ and "munificence" of their hireling sycophants, former rank-and-file politicians, now well-heeled quisling Parliamentarians, establish "the legality of an undeterminable amount of abstract money, ledger credit page entry, or paper notes, to be based on their gold loans to the state," "creation of a 'Bank' at London" from which, "unto a stranger thou mayest lend upon usury" "this money known as 'credit' as loan against real collateral throughout the whole kingdom," "that the LORD thy God may bless thee in all that thou settest thine hand to" in the creation of a permanent public debt against the strangers "in the land whither thou goest to possess it."

⁷⁶William Paterson, *A brief account of the intended Bank of England* (1694), p. 3, quoted in S. Bannister, *The Writings of William Paterson, with Biographical Notices of the Author*, 2nd ed. (1859) (London, 1858), vol. III, 80, quoted in Andréadès, 66–67.

⁷⁷Andréadès, 62.

⁷⁸Ibid, 63.

⁷⁹William Paterson, quoted in Christopher Hollis, *The Two Nations: A Financial Study of English History*, 1st American ed. (New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1936), 30. [Mr. Hollis' attribution is the earliest and only one, of which this writer is aware, in which the word "the" appears a second time (before the word "interest").]

⁸⁰Andréadès, 25.

⁸¹The loans made by the Bank to William III. [*sic*] and Queen Anne enabled England to regain that position among European nations which she had to all appearances hopelessly lost. Ibid, 3.

Ancient and modern strategic objective of goldsmith-bankers (private “money creators”): Commercial-military conquest and subjugation of Mankind.

The foregoing account is a brief but significant chapter in the career of the goldsmiths on this earth. The *modus operandi* of contemporary goldsmith-bankers is the same of those of antiquity; the first step of which is to supplant the existing circulating medium of exchange, through corruption of the leaders of the people in the temple, the priest-kings and “men of God,”⁸² with the idea of personal riches, in commodities over which the goldsmith-bankers hold an effective monopoly, namely gold, silver, and copper, the cost of excavation of which is prohibitive except through the use of slaves, one of the four main trades of the ancient goldsmiths, the others being money changing, silver bullion, and grain (at one time a circulating medium) [Astle, 20]; *to wit*:

Thus all, priest-kings and priests, came to forget that the foundations of the power given to them from on High towards the maintenance of the right living and tranquil procession through life, of their peoples, were the laws of distribution of surpluses as written on the scribes [*sic*] tablet; laws instituted by the god himself each ordering a specified dispensation from the surpluses in his warehouses in the Ziggurat, to the holder of the tablet. They too fell into the error of believing that silver with value created as a result of its being used as a balancing factor in international exchange could become a perpetual storehouse of value... [*sic*] They themselves became consumed in the scramble for this gleaming metal, so conceding it, through its controllers the power to set itself up in opposition to the law of the gods; to raise itself up in its own right, god in itself. [Astle, x]

Out of death and destruction was their harvest The only reality was control of precious metal... [*sic*] Out of death and destruction came the releasing in that day of the all important hoards of stored bullion, and the renewal of the slave herds to be consumed in mining ventures in distant places, garnering the increase of such precious metals... [*sic*]

“There are thus infinite numbers thrown into these mines, all bound in fetters kept at work night and day, and so strictly surrounded that there is no possibility of their effecting an escape. They are guarded by mercenary soldiers of various barbarous nations, whose language is foreign to them and to each other, so that there are no means of forming conspiracies or of corrupting those who are set to watch them. They are kept to incessant work by the rod of the overseer, who often lashes them severely. Not the least care is taken of the bodies of these poor creatures; they have not a rag to cover their nakedness; and whoever sees them must compassionate their melancholy and deplorable condition, for though they may be sick, maimed or lame, no rest nor any intermission of labour is allowed them. Neither the weakness of old age, nor the infirmities of females, excuse any from the work, to which all are driven by blows and cudgels; until borne down by the intolerable weight of their misery, many fall dead in the midst of their insufferable labours. Deprived of all hope, these miserable creatures expect each day to be worse than the last, and long for death to end their sufferings.”⁸³

The answer may be found to lie in the existence in very ancient Sumeria of a privileged class, who, having access to the “credit” of the temple, thus were able to control the masters of the great donkey caravans who carried such “credit”, or will of the god of the city, from one place of business to the other These persons . . . who must have functioned as bullion broker and banker, would have

⁸²Hence the people never questioned the existence of the temple but as the place where the will of the god was exercised through his servants... [*sic*] That it had come to function more as instrument . . . of sanctifying front for an international power concerned largely with money creation and the control of the slave trade, itself mainly of criminal antecedents . . .

The tremendous . . . trade of Delos, [Greece] especially in slaves . . . could not derive from anything else other than the acceptance of the “Credit” of the Temple from the hands of these aliens. These men would be skilled money changers . . . fully conversant with . . . such ledger credit page entry money, and whose . . . abstract inflation of the number of units of silver they claimed to control, depended on secrecy, and solidarity amongst themselves, and above all, on the patronage of the corrupted temples. Astle, 21–22.

⁸³Diodorus Siculus, quoted in A. del Mar: *History of the Precious Metals*, p. 40, slave labour in the Bisharee district of Nubia, B.C. 50, quoted in Astle, 44.

been fully clear on the subject of silver and its function in settlement of foreign trade balances and its use as a standard on which to base money accounting. . . . [Astle, 33]

Once co-opted, it is a simple matter to direct the energies of compromised priest-kings and leaders of the temples and nations and finance and equip their armies with the finest and most modern weapons of war and set them against the “enemies” of the goldsmiths; *to wit*:

The main discussion of the *Artha-Sastra* of Kautilya, Hindu classic instructing kings and rulers as to their proper conduct towards good government, was as to whether financial or military organization came first of all as the root of strength and power in any organized state.⁸⁴ Clearly in that day no less than in this day, financial organization preceded military organization; therefore there is not much point really in discussion of so obvious a fact and truth. . . .

Thus, and it has been demonstrated through history over and over again, it is clear there is one feature basic and decisive in the progression of human life . . . That feature, particularly in relatively modern societies from the bronze age onwards, and during that period of the rapid perfection of the mass production of weapons, is monetary organization, and what precious metals are available for purposes of international exchange as against the purchase of those finest of weapons and essential materials of war only obtainable abroad, and as wages for the most skilled men at arms from wherever obtainable, abroad or otherwise... [sic]

. . . [W]ars of the last three thousand years have not been relatively infrequent occurrences, and have been an incessantly recurring evil... [sic] It is no chance that the growth of warfare into a very cancer eating into the vitals of mankind . . . is parallel to the growth of that other cancer which is private, and therefore irresponsible, money creation and emission... [sic]

Those strange decisions of kings signalling the opening of wars as frightful and disastrous to the European peoples, as the last two so-called “World Wars” . . . are the directives of a force which cannot but be described in any way but as being wholly malevolent.⁸⁵

It seems there is no . . . admission of the folly of their misuse of this God-Power which they direct towards the good of themselves and their friends. Their obsession, despite ruin for all looming on every horizon, seems to remain the same narrow vision of the day of their own world supremacy wherein they will rule as absolute lords over all . . .

Kings largely became the mouthpiece and sword arm of those semi-secret societies that controlled the material of money as its outward and visible symbols came to be restricted to gold, silver, and copper... [sic] The fiat of the god in heaven . . . was replaced by the will of those . . . leaders of the world of slave drivers, caravaneers, outcasts, and criminals generally . . .

The law of the ruler previously exercised towards the well being of the people in that they might live a good and honourable life accordingly became corrupted. It became merely a symbol raised before their gaze, in order that they might not look down and see the evil gnawing away at the roots of the Tree of Life itself, destroying all peace and goodness. Nor could those semi-secret groups of persons be seen who so often were the sources of such evil. . . .

Through stealthy issue of precious metal commodity money into circulation amongst the peoples, replacing that money which represented the fiat or will of the god of the city and which was merely an order on the state warehouses through his scribes, this internationally minded group from the secrecy of their chambers were able to make a mockery of the faith and belief of simple people. The line of communication from god to man through priest-king and priest was cut, being replaced by their own twisted purposes such as they were; not however guiding mankind into the heaven that could have been and where all would be life, and light, and hope, but into such a hell as to escape from which men might gladly come to accept the idea of Mass Suicide... [sic]⁸⁶

⁸⁴Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan and Charles Moore, *A Source Book in Indian Philosophy* (Princeton; 1957), 219–220, cited in Astle, xi.

⁸⁵For example, the folly of Britain in letting itself and the Empire be stamped into these last two so-called “Great” wars, may be compared to that of the man described by the Emperor Augustus who goes fishing with a golden hook; he has everything lose and little to gain. (Suetonius: the Twelve Caesars II, 25.). [sic] Cited in Astle, xii.

⁸⁶Astle, *The Babylonian Woe*, xi–xiv. [Witness the self-immolation suicide epidemic in Tibet under China, whose overlords are the selfsame goldsmith-bankers at the World Bank in the District of Columbia.]

Benjamin Franklin reveals the cause of the Revolution.

The French and Indian War in America (1754–1763), financed by the Bank of England,⁸⁷ brings “prosperity” to Great Britain and the colonies, based on the injection of “new money” (costless, inflationary Bank of England bank-notes) for production of war materiel and wages for those who do the work. When such wars come to an end, however, as is the case in 1764 England, the “good times” are over and hard times (unemployment, higher prices) arrive.

About this time, Benjamin Franklin travels to Great Britain, where, in the midst of its current depression, he talks freely of the robust financial health of the colonies, an incongruity in the minds of the Englishmen with whom he speaks.⁸⁸

Robert Latham Owen, former Chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, and senator who introduces the legislation that sets up the Federal Reserve in 1913, apparently sees the error of his ways in supporting the Fed and places into the *Congressional Record* the following historical account of Franklin’s visit to England and events shortly thereafter; *to wit*:

Benjamin Franklin, on being asked in Great Britain how he accounted for the prosperous condition of the Colonies, said:

That is simple. It is only because in the Colonies we issue our own money. It is called colonial scrip, [⁸⁹] and we issue it in the proper proportion to the demand of trade and industry.

It was not very long until this information was brought to the Rothschilds’ bank, and they saw that here was a nation that was ready to be exploited; here was a nation that had been setting up an example that they could issue their own money in place of the money coming through the banks. So the Rothschild Bank caused a bill to be introduced in the English Parliament which provided that no colony of England could issue their own money. They had to use English money. Consequently the Colonies were compelled to discard their scrip and mortgage themselves to the Bank of England in order to get money. For the first time in the history . . . our money began to be based on debt.

Benjamin Franklin stated that in 1 year from that date the streets of the Colonies were filled with the unemployed, because when England exchanged with them, she gave the Colonies only half as many units of payment in borrowed money from the Rothschild Bank as they had in scrip. In other words, their circulating medium was reduced 50 percent, and everyone became unemployed. The poor houses became filled, according to Benjamin Franklin's own statement. . . .

He said that this was the original cause of the Revolutionary War. In his own language:

The Colonies would gladly have borne the little tax on tea and other matter had it not been that England took away from the Colonies their money, which created unemployment and dissatisfaction.⁹⁰ [Emphasis added.]

Goldsmith-bankers doing business in America in 1781.

The rich rules over the poor, and the borrower is the servant of the lender. [Proverbs 22:7]

[T]he policies of the monarch are always those of his creditors.⁹¹

Congressman John R. Rarick, 1971.

⁸⁷The English Government sought help from the Bank on the eve of all the eighteenth century wars. . . . Andréadès, 3–4.

⁸⁸Richard Kelly Hoskins, *War Cycles – Peace Cycles* (Lynchburg, Va.: Virginia Publishing Co., 1985), 160.

⁸⁹scrip. . . . a certificate to be exchanged for goods, as at a company store. *Webster’s Dictionary*, encyc. unabridged, s.v. “Scrip.”

⁹⁰Benjamin Franklin, quoted in John R. Elsom, *Lightning over the Treasury Building* (Boston: Forum Press, 1941), 29–30, quoted in Robert Latham Owen, *National Economy and the Banking System of the United States: An Exposition of the Principles of Modern Monetary Science in their Relation to the National Economy and the Banking System of the United States*, Senate Document No. 23, January 24, 1939, 76th Congress, 1st Session (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1939), 98–99.

⁹¹Rep. John R. Rarick, “Deficit Financing,” *Congressional Record* (House of Representatives), 92nd Congress, First Session, Vol. 117—Part 1, February 1, 1971, 1261.

When the *Second Bank of the United States* (second American central bank) fails in 1841 its records are made public, revealing that from the beginning most of its stock is held in England—i.e., that it and its instrumentalities are tools of English usurers (Bank of England); *to wit*:

As an act of goodwill, the new banks gave important politicians free stock, or stock at a very low price. Men will seldom raise their hand against something that benefits their pocketbooks. Most will actively encourage friends and associates to deal with the business in which they hold stock is that it will make them a profit.

This is what happened. Those who had received the gift of cheap stock in the private Bank of Pennsylvania, one of the first usury branches in America founded in 1781, were none other than Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, Alexander Hamilton, James Monroe, John Jay, John Paul Jones, and Commodore John Bary. Robert Morris, superintendent of finance for the Continental Congress on whom modern historians dote, was, as we might expect, a leading light. This is why the setting up of usury banking in America received so little opposition.

It is against human nature to fight the thing that pays well, but the Law is absolute. Violate one Law, and another stands behind to be triggered. “*Can two walk together, except they be agreed.*” *Amos* 3:3. One cannot oppose usury banks and at the same time own stock in those banks.

Association with usury banking made them junior partners and put them in the position of advancing the banking interests if they were to advance their own. They were removed from being an enemy if they expected their stock to prosper.

Usury banking was the nation’s biggest single foe. It was a far greater danger than was the king or the Church. The once sovereign countries of England, France, Spain, and Holland had been reduced to tentacles of the octopus whose name was usury. The same master, international usury banks, ruled them all. [U/L emphasis added.] [Hoskins, *Vigilantes of Christendom*, 185–186]

Sixteenth Article of Amendment to the Constitution.

Between 1864 and 1894 Congress make more than 60 attempts to enact a statute that justifies exaction of income tax from the American People—sovereigns over whom they have no personal legislative power. The judiciary disallows each for unconstitutionality.

The Federal Reserve Act, like its antecedent in England, is slated to introduce fractional-reserve banking in 1913, but Congress have yet to devise a tool that will induce the American People to “volunteer” to pay income tax and yet still pass muster with the Supreme Court.

Ubi quid generaliter conceditur, in est hæc exceptio, si non aliquid sit contra jus fasque. Where a thing is concealed generally, this exception arises, that there shall be nothing contrary to law and right.

Quicquid est contra normam recti est injuria. Whatever is against the rule of right is a wrong.

Ubique est injuria, ibi damnum sequitur. Wherever there is a wrong, there damage follows.

Nemo damnum facit, nisi qui id fecit quod facere jus non habet. No one is considered as committing damages, unless he is doing what he has no right to do.

The stated object of the legislative acts that give us the new “state,” and then “State,” is to provide *internal revenue* and pay interest on the public debt (the object of our investigation). “Internal revenue” means *revenue* derived from sources *internal* to the territory, persons, and subject matter over which Congress are authorized to exercise legislative power and jurisdiction.

On February 3, 1913, Congress enact the 16th Amendment to provide revenue from taxes on incomes in the “several States,” i.e., the Territories and District of Columbia; *to wit*:

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.

Strictly technically speaking, there is nothing improper about the above language: The Constitution authorizes Congress to impose an income tax, if they so choose, on persons residing in the Territories and the District of Columbia, the newly defined *States*.

However, whereas Congress and the judiciary know that “States” means only the Territories and the District of Columbia, the American People do not.

Also, that certain phrase “several States of the Union,” is truncated to “several States,” concealing that the “several States” are not *of the Union*.

Further, the proper legislative act is a rule or regulation under authority of the territorial clause Article 4 § 3(2) (*supra*, p. 2), not a constitutional amendment per se, which makes it inapposite and therefore willful, fraudulent, and treasonous. All Supreme Court Justices, United States District Judges, and Department of Justice personnel—whose lips remain sealed on this particular point and who, therefore, are complicit in the fraud and treason—rather opt for refuge in the judicial sanctuary of *strict interpretation of the language of the legislation* and the specially defined internal-revenue term that appears therein, lest they sink the ship of State.⁹²

Today, the controlling definition of the term “State” in the revenue laws means either (1) the District of Columbia, (2) Guam, (3) American Samoa, (4) the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, (5) Virgin Islands, or (6) the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands *and no other thing*⁹³; the geographical “United States,” the collective of the foregoing “States.”

Each of the so-called *50 States* (sans “of the Union”), e.g., “State of Mississippi,” “State of Vermont,” “State of Nevada,” etc. forgoes its proper name and goes by “state” in all legislation; usually preceded by the word/s “this” or “in this,” i.e., *this state* or *in this state*.

The term “State” in each of the foregoing examples means, literally, *District of Columbia*, i.e., “District of Columbia of Mississippi,” “District of Columbia of Vermont,” etc. Every “State of . . .” is a political subdivision of the District of Columbia and can be defined as follows:

That certain society of *Federal personnel*⁹⁴ and *United States Government employees*⁹⁵ entitled to receive Social Security retirement or survivor benefits who physically reside within the geographical limits of a particular Union state, but, based on political status, have legal residence in the District of Columbia and are the subject of all legislation therein.

The description of “political subdivision” in the preceding paragraph reveals how Congress evade and defeat the provisions of the Declaration of Independence and Constitution in their pursuit of personal legislative power and jurisdiction over the American People.

⁹²To their credit—*though not grounds for clemency*—this proves not to be the case at the moment of truth; *to wit*: No judge or United States Attorney has ever failed to dismiss, summarily, an income-tax case for lack of jurisdiction, upon the filing into the record of the case of a document prepared by this writer, demonstrating the meaning of “United States” and establishing that the defendant is not a *citizen of the United States* (*supra*, n. 12).

⁹³Thomas Clark Nelson, *Purging America of the Matrix* (Self-published, October 22, 2012), 15–16.

⁹⁴the term “Federal personnel” means officers and employees of the Government of the United States, members of the uniformed services (including members of the Reserve Components), individuals entitled to receive immediate or deferred retirement benefits under any retirement program of the Government of the United States (including survivor benefits). [Emphasis added.] United States Code (hereinafter “USC”) Title 5 *Government Organization and Employees* § 552a(a)(13).

⁹⁵For purposes of this chapter, the term “employee” includes an officer, employee, or elected official of the United States, a State, or any political subdivision thereof, or the District of Columbia, or any agency or instrumentality of any one or more of the foregoing. [Emphasis added.] Internal Revenue Code, Chapter 24 *Collection of Income Tax at Source on Wages* § 3401(c) *Employee*.

Congress incorporate and go into business.

Section 1 of the Act of February 21, 1871, provides, in pertinent part:

Be it enacted . . . That all that part of the territory of the United States included within the limits of the District of Columbia be, and the same is hereby, created into a government by the name of the District of Columbia, by which name it is hereby constituted a body corporate [⁹⁶] for municipal [⁹⁷] purposes, and may contract and be contracted with, sue and be sued, plea and be impleaded, have a seal, and exercise all other powers of a municipal corporation . . .⁹⁸ [U/L emphasis added.]

Prior to the Act of February 21, 1871, “District of Columbia” means only one thing: seat of the Government of the United States. Since then it has three distinct senses or meanings; *to wit*:

- Geographical: territory comprising the *seat* of the Government of the United States;
- Governmental: government created out of the *territory* comprising the seat of the Government of the United States; and
- Political: municipal corporation constituted for political purposes from the *name* of the government created out of the territory comprising the seat of the Government of the United States.

If not identified with particularity in official pronouncements/legislation it is impossible to know exactly which sense or meaning of “District of Columbia” is intended or applies.

The primary barrier to understanding State and Federal law is that it is littered with specially defined *terms*—which no longer have their character as *words*.

Further complicating things is use of another specially defined term, “includes,” which appears frequently within the definitions of other terms, especially “State” and “United States”—and there are no less than 75 different definitions of “United States” scattered throughout the 50 titles of the United States Code.

Rothschild shifts political power from the private Bank of England to the private Federal Reserve.

The Bank of England was thus created for political reasons, It was preceded by the goldsmiths and their banking methods, which again were due to political events and had received from them their peculiar form; it has been supported and attacked for political purposes.⁹⁹

The Federal Reserve is not an agency of government. It is a private banking monopoly.¹⁰⁰

Congressman John R. Rarick, 1971.

⁹⁶BODY CORPORATE. A corporation. *Black’s Law Dictionary*, 2nd ed., s.v. “Body Corporate.”

⁹⁷MUNICIPAL CORPORATION. A public corporation, created by government for political purposes, and having subordinate and local powers of legislation . . . [Emphasis added.] Ibid, s.v. “Municipal corporation.”

⁹⁸“An Act to provide a Government for the District of Columbia,” Ch. 62, Sec. 18, 16 Stat. 419, February 21, 1871; later legislated in “An Act Providing a Permanent Form of Government for the District of Columbia,” Ch. 180, Sec. 1, 20 Stat. 102, June 11, 1878, to remain and continue as a municipal corporation (brought forward from the Act of 1871, as provided in the Act of March 2, 1877, amended and approved March 9, 1878, i.e., Sec. 2 of the *Revised Statutes of the United States Relating to the District of Columbia . . . 1873–’74*); as amended by the Act of June 28, 1935, 49 Stat. 430, ch. 332, Sec. 1 (Title 1, Section 102, District of Columbia Code (1940)).

⁹⁹Andréadès, 11.

¹⁰⁰Rep. John R. Rarick, “Deficit Financing,” *Congressional Record* (House of Representatives), 92nd Congress, First Session, Vol. 117—Part 1, February 1, 1971, 1260.

The Federal Reserve Act (Ch. 6, 38 Stat. 251, December 23, 1913), is the creation of Baron Alfred Charles de Rothschild (1842–1918), Director of the private Bank of England,¹⁰¹ implemented via his straw author, Paul Moritz Warburg,¹⁰² a German banker and Rothschild confederate awarded United States citizenship in 1911 specifically for this purpose (later dubbed “Father of the Federal Reserve” by the *New York Times*). Each of the 12 private regional Federal Reserve banks is a private joint-stock company instituted under aegis of the novel District of Columbia, created/constituted February 21, 1871 (*supra*, n. 98), and patterned by its architect, Baron Rothschild, after the private Bank of England.

The Bank of England (joint-stock company), indisputably the most powerful political force formerly ever known, is “nationalized” March 1, 1946, shortly after a conference (attended by representatives of 44 different governments) in Bretton Woods, New Hampshire, July 1–22, 1944, and the founding of, among other things, the so-called International Monetary Fund (hereinafter “IMF”) and International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, later to be called the World Bank, both of which private banks will become operational in the District of Columbia in 1958. **The change in personality of the Bank of England in 1946 has no practical effect on the personal fortunes and political power amassed by the principals thereof up to this time.**

Rothschild’s straw architect of the two new private banks is the American representative, Harry Dexter White, a senior Treasury Department official conclusively posthumously identified as a Russian spy, codename “Jurist,”¹⁰³ and underling of the so-called *Secretary of the Treasury*, who is Governor of both World Bank and IMF but who, per amendment to the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, does not work for the United States Government,¹⁰⁴ yet is authorized to exercise, summarily and unilaterally, the same plenary executive power over the private Federal Reserve banking system as does the President of the United States.¹⁰⁵

Two kinds of banks.

THE Bank of England is the oldest of the European national banks. . . . The expression “national” banks also enables us to distinguish those institutions from genuine State banks.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰¹Eustace Mullins, *The World Order: Our Secret Rulers*, 2nd ed., 1992 election ed. (Staunton, Va.: Ezra Pound Institute of Civilization, 1992), 102.

¹⁰²*Ibid.*, 128.

¹⁰³“PURPOSE: To advise you of positive identification of agent Jurist (the cover name of a Soviet agent operating in 1944 and named by [Venona project]) as Harry Dexter White, deceased. White was formerly the Administrative Assistant to former Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau.” Office Memorandum, United States Government (public domain), from Mr. Ladd to the Director of the FBI, October 16, 1950.

“ . . . the most highly-placed asset the Soviets possessed in the American government.” John Earl Haynes, Harvey Klehr, and Alexander Vassiliev, *Spies: The Rise and Fall of the KGB in America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 258.

¹⁰⁴The second part of the amendments prohibits the [Secretary of the Treasury] from receiving salary or other compensation from the U.S. Government. . . . The U.S. Secretary of the Treasury receives no compensation for representing the United States. Senate Report No. 94-1148 of Oct. 1, 1976, re amendment of Bretton Woods Agreements Act, P.L. 94-564, 90 Stat. 2660, re § 2 of House Report 13955 [p. 8], 5942.

No person [e.g., Secretary of the Treasury] shall be entitled to receive any salary or other compensation from the United States for services as a Governor [of the World Bank, IMF, etc.] . . . 22 USC § 286a(d)(1).

¹⁰⁵The actions, regulations, rules, licenses, orders and proclamations heretofore or hereafter taken, promulgated, made, or issued by the President of the United States or the Secretary of the Treasury since March 4, 1933, pursuant to the authority conferred by section 95a of this title, are approved and confirmed. 12 USC § 95b *Ratification of acts of President and Secretary of the Treasury under § 95a*.

Note: One or the other, the President of the United States or Secretary of the Treasury, is the senior official; to wit:

Duo non possunt in solido unam rem possidere. Two cannot possess one thing each in entirety.

¹⁰⁶Andréadès, *History of the Bank of England*, 3.

Federal Reserve Banks . . . are not federal instrumentalities . . . but are independent, privately owned and locally controlled corporations.¹⁰⁷

National banks (e.g., Federal Reserve) are not genuine *state*, i.e., government, banks; they are privately owned businesses. Each commercial bank in the Federal Reserve System is a so-called *national (banking) association* (designated “N.A.”) (Federal Reserve Act §§ 1–2) and bank.

Subscribers to the capital stock of gold of the private Bank of England (corporation) of 1694 are *private parties*. Subscribers to the capital stock of gold of the 12 private “Federal reserve banks” (corporations) of 1913 are the *private commercial banks* within each respective district.¹⁰⁸

Neither the Federal Reserve nor World Bank nor IMF answers to any government. Each aforesaid private bank is an institutional proxy of the principals of the formerly private Bank of England (parent bank of all three), incorporated under the aegis of the novel District of Columbia (*supra*, n. 98), and, in effect, a sovereign world power.

Through entrapment, bribery, blackmail, and other related intrigues, goldsmith-bankers of the private Bank of England corrupt or coerce a sufficient number of Members of Congress so as to secure political control of that organ of government—as the nature and content of congressional legislation evinces—no later than June 30, 1864 (*supra*, n. 15).

Lawful remedy for the instant “form of Government”.

Regula pro lege, si deficit lex. In default of the law, the maxim rules.

Delegata potestas non potest delegari. A delegated authority cannot be again delegated.

It is irrelevant that there is no provision in the Constitution that expressly forbids Congress to delegate the “Power . . . To coin Money [and] regulate the Value thereof” (Article 1 § 8(5)). Absence of constitutional authorization to delegate a delegated power means that any such act is void *ab initio*¹⁰⁹ (the Federal Reserve, however, comes in under Article 4 § 3(2), not 1 § 8(5)).

The lawful solution for the instant national situation is prescribed in that certain supreme instrument of creation from which all descendant legislative acts, including the Articles of Confederation, Constitution, Bill of Rights, and all other acts of Congress derive their authority and power, from which every lawful *form of Government* in America is derived, and upon which all Americans since July 4, 1776, rely and depend for good order in their daily lives, *The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America*; the Preamble of which provides, in pertinent part:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these, are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness. That, to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just Powers from the consent of the governed. That, whenever any form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such Principles, and organizing its Powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness. [Emphasis added.]

¹⁰⁷ *John L. Lewis v. United States of America*, 680 F.2d 1239 (9th Cir. 1982).

¹⁰⁸“Each Federal Reserve Bank is a separate corporation owned by commercial banks in its region.” Ibid, 1242. [The subscription amount for each commercial bank is 6% of its own capital stock, in gold or gold certificates, deposited with the “Federal reserve bank” in its district. (Federal Reserve Act § 2)]

¹⁰⁹AB INITIO. Lat. From the beginning ; from the first act. . . . *Black’s Law Dictionary*, 2nd ed., s.v. “Ab initio”]

The particular *form of Government* that is destructive of the security of the unalienable Rights of “Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness” is that certain municipal corporation and de facto shadow national government by the name of the *District of Columbia*, created and operated by Congress continuously since February 21, 1871 (*supra*, n. 98). The de jure (by right) American Republic is moribund, relegated to the background in favor of the aforesaid political-commercial-federal *form of Government* lorded over, ultimately, by foreign bankers (*see* Nelson, *Purging America of the Matrix*, nn. 74–75, p. 25).

The Federal Reserve is the spawn of goldsmith-bankers and bullion brokers of the private Bank of England, whose monetary policies in 1776 (*supra*, n. 90), enforced via their primary debtor-servant at the time, King George III, cause British subjects in the American colonies to absolve themselves of “all Allegiance to the British Crown,”¹¹⁰ dissolve “all political connexion between them and the State of Great Britain,”¹¹¹ and proclaim sovereignty over their own existence. The Civil Rights Act of April 9, 1866, 14th and 16th Amendments, and avalanche of income-tax legislation in the wake of the Federal Reserve Act, dictated by the same goldsmith-bankers, are efforts to convince the American People (creators of the United States of America) that they are no longer self-governing, self-protecting, successor sovereigns to King George III, but *taxpayers, persons, citizens*, and inferior political *subjects* of Congress.

Goldsmith-bankers at the Federal Reserve create “an undeterminable amount of abstract money”.

The process by which banks create money is so simple the mind is repelled . . .¹¹²

John Kenneth Galbraith, 1975.

When a savings and loan association, an insurance company, or a credit union makes a loan, it lends the very dollars that its customers have previously paid in. But when a bank makes a loan, it simply adds to the borrower’s deposit account in the bank by the amount of the loan. This money is not taken from anyone else’s deposit; it was not previously paid in to the bank by anyone. It’s new money, created by the bank for the use of the borrower.¹¹³

Robert B. Anderson (Secretary of the Treasury), 1959.

The fraud of fractional-reserve lending is explained best by the perpetrators themselves; *to wit*:

In the United States neither paper currency nor deposits have value as commodities. Intrinsically a dollar bill is just a piece of paper, deposits merely book entries. . . .

What they [banks] do when they make loans is to accept promissory notes in exchange for credits to the borrowers’ . . . accounts.¹¹⁴ [Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago]

Money for loans comes from . . . institutions such as banks, which have the power, within limits, to create money in checking-type accounts when they make loans.¹¹⁵ [Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia]

¹¹⁰Ibid, *The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America* of July 4, 1776, Conclusion.

¹¹¹Ibid.

¹¹²John Kenneth Galbraith, *Money: Whence It Came, Where It Went* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1975) 18.

¹¹³Robert B. Anderson, quoted in “How Much Will Your Dollar Buy – Interview with Secretary of the Treasury Robert B. Anderson,” *U.S. News & World Report*, August 31, 1959, 68–69.

¹¹⁴*Modern Money Mechanics: A Workbook on Bank Reserves and Deposit Expansion*, Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, 1994, 3–6.

If it [a bank] makes loans, it will simply credit the checking accounts of the borrowers. . . . new money, in the form of additional checkable deposits, will be “created.”¹¹⁶ [Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia]

Because the bulk of a bank’s loans are made by simply crediting the customer-borrower’s deposit account, the loan in fact becomes new deposit money.¹¹⁷ [Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond]

[M]oney exists simply as a bookkeeping entry at a bank . . .¹¹⁸ [Federal Reserve Bank of New York]

When the Fed pays the [securities] dealers, a hundred million dollars will thereby be added to the country’s money supply, because the dealers will be credited that amount by their banks, which now have that much more money on deposit.

But where did the Fed get that hundred million dollars?

“We created it,” a Fed official tells me. He means that anytime the central bank writes a check, so to speak, it creates money. “It’s money that didn’t exist before,” he says.

Is there any limit on that?

“No limit. Only the good judgment and the conscience of the responsible Federal Reserve people.”¹¹⁹ [Emphasis added.]

In 2008, when the estimated annual rate of inflation surpasses the *quadrillions* of percent in Zimbabwe, the Mugabe regime ceases tracking it. An article with the improbable title “Lack of Bank Note Paper Threatens Zimbabwe Economy” chronicles the effects of inflation in that small country on a yearly, monthly, and hourly basis; *to wit*:

As hyperinflation spiraled last year, Fidelity [Printers] printed million-dollar notes, then 5-million, 10-million, 25-million, 50-million. This year, it has been forced to print 100-million, 250-million and 500-million notes in rapid succession, all now practically worthless. The highest denomination is now 50 billion Zimbabwean dollars (worth a U.S. dollar on the street).

Despite the recent currency shortage, the Zimbabwean dollar has continued to slide against the U.S. dollar and shopkeepers are still increasing their prices steeply. The price of the state-owned Herald newspaper has leaped from 200,000 Zimbabwean dollars early this month to 25 billion now. Before the crunch, a beer at a bar in Harare, the capital, cost 15 billion Zimbabwean dollars. At 5 p.m. July 4, it cost 100 billion (\$4 at the time) in the same bar.

An hour later, the price had gone up to 150 billion (\$6).¹²⁰

“Amateur hour” in Zimbabwe in 2008 reveals an utter lack of understanding of “responsible” (incremental stealth) “money creation” (imposture), the inevitable consequences of which (hyperinflation) cannot be overridden by any amount of *fiat money*,¹²¹ no matter how important or powerful one might think he is (or be). “Inflation” may be defined as follows:

¹¹⁵*The Hats the Federal Reserve Wears*, Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia, 11.

¹¹⁶*The Federal Reserve Today: Fed Funds Rate, Discount Rate*, 11th ed., Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia, 1994, 21.

¹¹⁷*Your Money: A Review of Money in the United States*, 3rd ed., Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond, 1991, 17.

¹¹⁸*The Story of Money*, Federal Reserve Bank of New York, 2009, 17.

¹¹⁹Peter T. White, “The Power of Money,” *National Geographic*, January 1993, 84.

¹²⁰<http://www.latimes.com/news/la-fg-money14-2008jul14.0.3251417.full.story>, *Los Angeles Times*, “Lack of Bank Note Paper Threatens Zimbabwe Economy,” July 14, 2008. [For photos at the time the rate of inflation is at 231-million percent: <http://www.boncherry.com/blog/2008/10/26/global-crisis-this-is-the-real-crisis/>]

Highest-denominated note printed at the time: **Z\$100 trillion** (worth about US\$2). Mugabe abandons the Zimbabwe dollar shortly thereafter; whereupon, all domestic debt is wiped out, foreign currencies appear (US Dollar, Euro, British Pound, South African Rand), and the Zimbabwe economy begins to flourish as though nothing had happened. Alf Field, “Zimbabwe: A Fresh Start,” <http://www.321gold.com/editorials/field/field111109.html>.

¹²¹*fiat money . . . money (as paper currency) that is not convertible into coin or specie of equivalent value and thus is dependent for its value on the decree of government.* *Merriam-Webster’s Unabridged Dictionary*, inc. version 2.5, s.v. “Fiat money.”

fiat . . . Etymology: Latin, let it be done . . . Ibid, s.v. “Fiat.”

A proportional increase in the amount of currency in circulation compared to the amount of products available for sale/purchase over the same period of time.

True value (survival) lies in *product* supply, not *currency* supply. Relatively more currency means sellers of products can and will charge higher prices for the same products—and get them. The “99¢” and “Dollar” stores of today are the “Five & Dimes” (5¢ & 10¢ stores) of the early 20th century. The type of product available in these stores today is essentially the same as then—but now it takes 20–24 times as much “money” (currency) to buy the same article. The amount of currency in circulation today is proportionally higher than the amount of products produced and available for purchase since that time. The *true price* of products is not going up; the *true value* of the currency is going down—requiring more of it to buy the same article.

Principal amounts of “loans” of credit to the government are never repaid (*supra*, n. 31) and form the basis of the “public debt of the United States” that “shall not be questioned” (14th Amendment § 4). *Interest* on the public debt, however, till 1933, must be paid in gold.¹²²

Loans of digits to the American People from commercial banks include only the principal amount. Digits needed for interest payments do not exist, making it mathematically impossible to pay off both principal and interest, thereby ensuring defaults, foreclosures, and bankruptcies: inevitable effects of the private Federal Reserve fractional-reserve lending scheme.

The only immediate solution to the need for digits (“checkbook money”) is to borrow more: As of this writing the so-called national debt (digits of “debt”) is \$16+ trillion and rising.

In 1622, goldsmiths and bullion brokers of the private Bank of Amsterdam realize the value to their “profession” of an income tax, but are unable to push it through in Holland (*supra*, n. 51).

In 1799, the same line of goldsmiths effectuates the first income tax ever (via William Pitt) and it is a “success.” In 1806 the tax is raised to 10 percent; revenues increase even further.¹²³

The Federal Reserve Act is enacted in late 1913 and Federal Reserve Notes begin hitting the streets in 1916. At that time the main focus of the goldsmith-bankers is implementation of the personal income tax, to keep the effects of inflation in an “acceptable” range, so it is not a cause for alarm among victims of the swindle. A barrage of income-tax legislation¹²⁴ on the heels of the 16th Amendment keeps the American People agitated from the shock that, for the first time in history, Congress are claiming legislative power and jurisdiction over their personal lives, liberty, and property.

Congress unveil the new “United States” in 1916.

Between 1864 and 1916 Congress only infer the meaning of the proper noun “United States” to be the collective of the so-called *States* (the Territories and District of Columbia) based on the meaning of that term (“State,” which appears within the proper noun “United States”). The revenue act of September 8, 1916, officially transforms “United States” into a specialized term (like “State”) with its own restricted meaning; *to wit*:

SEC. 200. That when used in this title— . . . The term “United States” means only the States, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and the District of Columbia; . . .¹²⁵ [Emphasis added.]

¹²²Federal Reserve Act § 18.

In 1933, after the goldsmith-bankers collect nearly all American gold in interest payments on loans of credit and ship it to England and Germany, they outlaw ownership of gold and order Roosevelt to accuse the American People of hoarding it (Executive Order 6102, April 5, 1933) and Congress to (1) dishonor all promises-to-pay gold (Gold Certificates), (2) suspend the gold standard, and (3) abrogate the gold clause of the Constitution (House Joint Resolution 192 of June 5, 1933). Congress open Fort Knox in 1935 as a “gold repository.”

¹²³Andréadès, *History of the Bank of England*, 183.

¹²⁴E.g., income-tax acts of 1916, 1917, 1918, 1921, 1924, 1926, 1928, 1929, 1932, 1934, 1935, 1938, etc.

¹²⁵“An Act To [*sic*] increase the revenue, and for other purposes,” Ch. 463, Sec. 200, 39 Stat. 756, September 8, 1916.

Searching the same Act for the meaning of the term “State” (which appears within the above definition of “United States”) we find:

SEC. 15. That the word “State” or “United States” when used in this title shall be construed to include any Territory, the District of Columbia, Porto [*sic*] Rico, and the Philippine Islands . . .

The full extent of the meaning of the definition of “State” and “United States” in Section 15 is determined by two factors: (1) use of the phrase “any Territory,” which necessarily embraces all other Territories in 1916 not listed in the definition, and (2) the absence of general words following the specific things listed in the definition, requiring application of the rule/principle/maxim of statutory interpretation previously delineated *supra*, nn. 16–17, known as *expressio unius est exclusio alterius* (“the inclusion of the one is the exclusion of the other”).

Whereas, the above rule of statutory interpretation does not apply to every statutory listing or grouping, only to those where the items expressed are all “members of an associated group,” such is the case with said Section 15 because all things listed are component members of properties other than Places purchased for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings, over which Congress exercise exclusive territorial jurisdiction.

Wherefore, the full extent of the meaning of the definition in Section 15 embraces all of the said properties listed therein, as well as those not listed; i.e., Alaska, Hawaii, American Samoa, Guam, Midway Islands, and the Panama Canal Zone. The several states of the Union are deemed excluded from the meaning of “State” and “United States” by deliberate choice.

Further, since the District of Columbia and the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii¹²⁶ are all *States* per definition in Section 15, it is misleading to enumerate all three individually in combination with the term “States” in the definition of “United States” in Section 200, as though they are something different, which they are not; to wit:

The passage “the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and the District of Columbia” may be deleted from the definition of “United States” in Section 200 without changing its meaning.

All the lexical gymnastics in Sections 15 and 200 of the Act of September 8, 1916, are superfluous: The terms “State” and “United States” include only the Territories and the District of Columbia, which meaning traces to, and accords with, the Act of June 30, 1864. Such deceit is necessary in order to prepare the sovereign American People to agree with the idea that they are “citizens of the United States”—and therefore *taxpayers* and liable to income tax.

Goldsmith-bankers use same M.O. to get the sovereign American People to “volunteer” to pay income tax.

To garner general public support for introduction of certain institutions essential to the goldsmith-bankers’ plans, such are piggybacked onto other social causes and legislation with which a majority of the public are certain to sympathize and agree; *e.g.*:

- To prepare the English people for general acceptance of what in 12 years will be “William Paterson’s” scheme for the new Bank of England (*supra*, n. 63), the cause of replacing funds routinely “borrowed” (pilfered) by the king from the Orphans’ Fund (administered by the Court of Orphans in behalf of orphans of deceased English freemen) “*by means of the profits which might result from the creation of a bank*” is adopted and promoted in

¹²⁶Upon admission to the Union in 1959 (43 years after the subject Revenue Act of September 8, 1916), Alaska and Hawaii lose their status as *States* of the United States; *to wit:*

When used in the regulations in this subpart, the term “State” includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii before their admission as States . . . [Emphasis added.] Title 26 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 31.3121(e)–1(a).

1682 via the most effective medium at the time, the pamphlet; the title of which is *Corporation Credit or a Bank of Credit made current by common consent in London more useful and safe than Money*.¹²⁷

- Whereas, the advertised purpose of the 14th Amendment is to ensure observance of the “humanitarian” provisions of the Civil Rights Act of April 9, 1866—which guarantees, among other things, to “all persons born in the United States,” “of every race and color, without regard to any previous condition of slavery or involuntary [¹²⁸] servitude,” the “full and equal benefit of all [statutory] laws”; the Amendment rather prepares all Americans (whether sovereign or slave) for *voluntary* servitude as a so-called *citizen of the United States*, with legal residence in the District of Columbia, subject to the absolute exclusive personal legislative power and jurisdiction of Congress, and liable to income tax.

Following the Roaring 20s (easy loans of credit/digits after the Federal Reserve Act), the savings, wealth, and estates of millions of Americans are wiped out by the goldsmith-banker-orchestrated stock-market crash of 1929 and Great Depression. Many Americans, especially the elderly, are unable to provide for their own needs. In an apparent act of benevolence, Congress institute a “solution” for this terrible state of affairs: a “personal retirement program of the Government of the United States,” in what is called the Social Security Act of August 14, 1935.

What is not generally disclosed to the American People is that:

1. The program has all the elements of what is defined in law as a Ponzi scheme¹²⁹;
2. Participants retain no accrued property rights to their contributions to the program¹³⁰;
3. Anyone entitled to receive Social Security retirement or survivor benefits—a franchise and political right (*infra*, n. 150)—upon acceptance of which right from the *political* District of Columbia, establishes legal residence in the *geographical* District of Columbia (*supra*, n. 7) and becomes:
 - a. a member of the class defined as *Federal personnel* and United States Government employee,¹³¹
 - b. a so-called *individual*¹³² and *citizen of the United States*¹³³;
 - c. a so-called *person*,¹³⁴ with political and civil rights conferred by Congress;
 - d. the subject of all legislation within the District of Columbia,¹³⁵ DBA United States®¹³⁶;

¹²⁷ Andréadès, *History of the Bank of England*, 49.

¹²⁸ Inclusion of “involuntary servitude” is superfluous; “slavery” is sufficient. Usage introduces concept of *voluntary* servitude, to which most Americans will “agree,” via erroneous belief as to meaning of “United States.”

¹²⁹ For exhaustive exposition of this point see Nelson, *Purging America of the Matrix*, 9–13.

¹³⁰ To engraft upon the social security system a concept of accrued property rights would deprive it of the flexibility and boldness in adjustment to ever-changing conditions which it demands. *Flemming v. Nestor*, 363 U.S. 603, 4 L.Ed.2d 1435, 80 S.Ct. 1367 (1960).

¹³¹ the term “Federal personnel” means . . . individuals entitled to receive immediate or deferred retirement benefits under any retirement program of the Government of the United States (including survivor benefits). [Emphasis added.] United States Code Title 5 *Government Organization and Employees* § 552a(a)(13).

¹³² the term “individual” means a citizen of the United States or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence . . . [Emphasis added.] Ibid, § 552a(a)(2).

¹³³ The United States is located in the District of Columbia. Uniform Commercial Code § 9-307(h).

¹³⁴ “person” includes an individual, partnership, corporation, association, or public or private organization other than an agency; . . . [Emphasis added.] United States Code Title 5 § 551(2).

¹³⁵ *And be it further enacted*, That the legislative power of the District shall extend to all rightful subjects of legislation within said District . . . [U/L emphasis added.] “An Act to provide a Government for the District of Columbia,” Ch. 62, Sec. 18, 16 Stat. 419, February 21, 1871.

¹³⁶ United States Department of Commerce Census Bureau form entitled “United States® Census 2010.”

- e. citizen of the federal government¹³⁷ (political District of Columbia); and
- f. *taxpayer*,¹³⁸ personally liable (voluntary servitude) for payment of his “fair share” of interest on the national debt (*supra*, n. 31) incurred by Congress and owed to the Federal Reserve, in the form of income tax.¹³⁹

Holy of Holies: Legal meaning of “United States”.

Ex uno disces omnes. From one thing you can discern all.¹⁴⁰

The body of law upon which hinges the existence of the Federal Reserve is Title 26 of the United States Code, i.e., the Internal Revenue Code (hereinafter “IRC”). The biggest secret in America and most important term in IRC, around which literally everything else revolves, is “United States.”

The controlling definition of the IRC terms “United States” and “State” is found in IRC § 7701, which provides, in pertinent part:

- (a) When used in this title, where not otherwise distinctly expressed . . .
 - (9) United States
The term “United States” when used in a geographical sense includes only the States and the District of Columbia. [¹⁴¹]
 - (10) State
The term “State” shall be construed to include the District of Columbia . . .

The IRC term “includes,” used in the definition of “United States,” is defined as follows:

The terms “includes” and “including” when used in a definition contained in this title shall not be deemed to exclude other things otherwise within the meaning of the term defined. [IRC § 7701(c)]

The above definition is a hybrid composite of two principal rules of statutory interpretation: (1) *expressio unius est exclusio alterius* (“the inclusion of the one is the exclusion of the other,” defined *supra*, nn. 16–17), and (2) *ejusdem generis* (“of the same kind”), defined as follows:

¹³⁷A citizen of the United States is a citizen of the federal government . . . *Kitchens v. Steele*, D.C.W.D. Mo., 112 F.Supp. 383 (1953).

¹³⁸The revenue laws are a code or system in regulation of tax assessment and collection. They relate to taxpayers, and not to nontaxpayers. The latter are without their scope. No procedure is prescribed for nontaxpayers, and no attempt is made to annul any of their rights and remedies in due course of law. With them Congress does not assume to deal, and they are neither of the subject nor of the object of the revenue laws. [Emphasis added] *Long v. Rasmussen*, [9 Cir.] D.C.Mont. 1922, 281 F. 236. [Also cited *supra*, n. 11]

¹³⁹Resistance to additional income taxes would be even more widespread if people were aware that . . . 100 percent of what is collected [in income tax] is absorbed solely by interest on the Federal debt In other words, all individual income tax revenues are gone before one nickel is spent on the services which taxpayers expect from their Government. [Emphasis added.] J. Peter Grace, “President’s Private Sector Survey on Cost Control: A Report to the President,” dated and approved January 12 and 15, 1984, 3.

FULL FAITH AND CREDIT phrase meaning that the full taxing . . . power . . . is pledged in payment of interest . . . of a bond issued by a government entity. U.S. Government securities . . . are backed by this pledge. [Emphasis added.] John Downes and Jordan Elliot Goodman, *Dictionary of Finance and Investment Terms*, 6th ed. (Hauppauge, N.Y.: Barron’s Educational Series, Inc., 2003), s.v. “Full faith and credit.”

¹⁴⁰*Bouvier’s Law Dictionary*, 6th ed., s.v. “Maxim.”

Unless the defendant can establish that he is not a citizen of the United States, the IRS possesses authority to attempt to determine his federal tax liability. [Emphasis added.] *United States v. Slater* (D. Del., 1982), 545 F.Supp. 179, 182. [Also cited *supra*, n. 12.]

¹⁴¹The District of Columbia is one of “the States”; wherefore, this definition is misleading and a tautology.

EJUSDEM GENERIS . . . A rule of statutory construction . . . providing that where general words follow enumerations of particular classes of persons or things, the general words shall be construed as applicable only to persons or things of the same general kind as those enumerated. [*Barron's Dictionary of Legal Terms*, 1983 ed., s.v. “Ejusdem generis”]

Example: “Cats, dogs, and other animals” extends only to other *domestic* animals.¹⁴²

The other things otherwise within the meaning of the term defined (i.e., “United States”) are all the unnamed “States” which, so long as they are of the same general kind as those enumerated in the definition, shall not be deemed excluded from the meaning of “United States.”¹⁴³

The controlling definition of “State” (IRC 7701(a)(10), *supra*) does not tell us very much; only that the District of Columbia is *construed* to be a State [Note: The word “include,” used in this definition of “State,” is not an IRC term, so IRC § 7701(c) does not apply.]

The preamble to the controlling definition of the IRC terms “United States” and “State” (IRC § 7701(a), *supra*) provides an instruction as to what to do to identify the other States, besides the District of Columbia, that are embraced by the definition of “United States”; *to wit*:

When used in this title, where not otherwise distinctly expressed . . . [Emphasis added.]

Wherefore, since the content of the controlling definition of “State” in IRC § 7701(a)(10) is insufficient to determine what other States are included in the definition of “United States,” we must look elsewhere in IRC to find where said States are “distinctly expressed.”

IRC § 3121(e)(1) defines “State” as follows:

The term “State” includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa. [Emphasis added.]

Use of the term “includes” in the definition of “State” requires the same application as with “United States.” Wherefore, we need to identify other members of the associated group of “States” that are of the same general kind as those enumerated in IRC § 3121(e)(1), just not named.

The District of Columbia is a State only because the controlling definition of “State” (IRC § 7701(a)(10)) *construes* it to be such; which definition makes no mention of any other State. Wherefore, we can disregard the District of Columbia as being a member of the same associated group or of the same general kind listed in the definition of “State” in IRC § 3121(e)(1).

Searching the Secretary of the Treasury’s website, www.irs.gov, we discover that the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa are all ***insular U.S. possessions that have their own governments and tax systems***; *to wit*, in pertinent part:

U.S. possessions can be divided into two groups:

1. Those that have their own governments and their own tax systems (Puerto Rico, U.S. Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands), and
2. Those that do not have their own governments and their own tax systems . . .

The governments of the first group of territories impose their own income taxes and withholding taxes on their own residents. . . .¹⁴⁴ [Emphasis added.]

In addition to the four insular U.S. possessions with their own respective government and tax system listed in the definition of the term “State” in IRC § 3121(e)(1), there is one—and only one—other: The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

¹⁴² *A Dictionary of Law*, 5th ed., Elizabeth A. Martin, ed., s.v. “Interpretation of statutes.”

¹⁴³ This writer can ascertain no reason to convert “includes” and “including” into IRC terms other than engrafting upon the already arcane definition of “United States” and “State,” another layer of encryption.

¹⁴⁴ <http://www.irs.gov/Individuals/International-Taxpayers/Persons-Employed-In-U.S.-Possessions>, “Persons Employed In a U.S. Possession / Territory - FIT,” IRS.gov.

Wherefore, “United States” when used in a:

- **Geographical sense** means the collective of the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands *and no other thing*, per IRC § 7701(a)(9).

The above sense/meaning of “United States” holds not just in IRC but in all other code, law, rules, regulations, legislation, etc., both State and Federal, because all are *in pari materia (infra)* with each other, i.e., must, perforce, agree with each other in order to prevent contradiction and fracturing of the system; *to wit*:

in pari materia . . . [Latin “in the same matter”] . . . On the same subject; relating to the same matter. • It is a canon of construction that statutes that are *in pari materia* may be construed together, so that inconsistencies in one statute may be resolved by looking at another statute on the same subject. . . . [Black’s Law Dictionary, 7th ed., s.v. “*In pari materia*”]

- **Governmental sense** means the District of Columbia; *to wit*:

The Congress shall have Power . . . To exercise exclusive Legislation . . . over such District . . . as may . . . become the Seat of the Government of the United States . . . [Emphasis added.] [Constitution, Article 1 § 8(17)]

The District is created a government by the name of the “District of Columbia” . . . [Emphasis added.] [Revised Statutes of the United States Relating to the District of Columbia . . . 1873–’74 § 2, *supra*, n. 98]

The geographical District of Columbia is the location of the Governments of the United States (March 4, 1789) and District of Columbia (June 11, 1878, *supra*, n. 98)—both of which are run from the same place, Capitol Hill, by the same people, Congress, who omit to divulge that the only Americans personally subject to the legislation of the Government of the United States are citizens or residents (actual or legal) of the District of Columbia.

- **Political sense** means the District of Columbia; *to wit*:

“United States” means— (A) a Federal [*District of Columbia municipal*] corporation; . . . [Title 28 USC *Judiciary and Judicial Procedure* § 3002(15)]

The District of Columbia is a Federal corporation (municipal) of which the President of the United States is CEO,¹⁴⁵ incorporated for political purposes continuously since February 21, 1871 (*supra*, n. 98), “and having subordinate and local [District of Columbia] powers of legislation” (*supra*, n. 97) known as *administrative law*; *to wit*:

administrative law. The law governing the organization and operation of the executive branch of government (including independent agencies) and the relations of the executive [President of the United States] with the legislature, the judiciary, and the public . . .¹⁴⁶ [Emphasis added.]

The Social Security franchise/contract operates to subject the American People to statutory legislation—a fate otherwise obviated by the Declaration of Independence and a menace essential to goldsmith-banker control of the otherwise sovereign American People:

The contest, for ages, has been to rescue Liberty from the grasp of executive power.¹⁴⁷

The so-called *alphabet-soup agencies* are tools of the political (municipally incorporated) District of Columbia, under direction of the CEO (Commander in Chief) thereof; *e.g.*:

¹⁴⁵See Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1967, Eff. Aug. 11, 1967 (in part), 32 F.R. 11669, 81 Stat. 948, as amended Pub. L. 90-623, § 7(b), Oct. 22, 1968, 82 Stat. 1315. Title 5A USC (Appendix).

¹⁴⁶Black’s Law Dictionary, 7th ed., s.v. “Administrative law.”

¹⁴⁷Daniel Webster (American statesman and senator, 1782–1852), speech in the U.S. Senate, May 27, 1834, *The Works of Daniel Webster*, 10th ed., vol. 4, 133.

United States® Census 2010 [United States Department of Commerce form (*see* United States® Census Bureau, www.census.gov, for other uses of this registered trademark)]

- **Commercial sense** means the District of Columbia; *to wit*:

The United States is located in the District of Columbia. [Uniform Commercial Code § 9-307(h)]

And the “secret” is no more.

Notice that “United States” and “U.S.” are almost always singular proper nouns (meaning District of Columbia) in media reports.

Comparing the language of the Declaration of Independence, and even the Constitution, to the ocean of incomprehensibility enacted by Congress that is the Internal Revenue Code and myriad other State and Federal bodies of law, it is easy to see that the intentions of those in charge today are different from those in 1776, who actually confront the situation, declare sovereignty over their own existence, break free of the tyranny, and defeat the army, navy, and paid horde of 30,000 professional killers (Hessian mercenaries) of the goldsmith-bankers’ debtor-servant gunsel,¹⁴⁸ King George III—the respective contemporary counterparts of whom are the (1) selfsame house of goldsmith-bankers, (2) CEO of the governmental-political District of Columbia, and (3) said CEO’s territorial army of alphabet-soup agents¹⁴⁹ and other officers and personnel of the 50 political subdivisions of the District of Columbia (i.e., those of the “State of . . .” variety).

Who is liable to income tax?

Dolus versatur in generalibus. Fraud deals in generalities.

Dolosus versatur in generalibus. A deceiver deals in generalities.

We know from IRC and the Secretary of the Treasury that in a geographical sense there are only six (6) States of the United States, and that the governments of the five (5) *insular-U.S. possession* States have their own respective government and tax system and impose their own income taxes and withholding taxes on their own residents (*supra*, n. 144); *which residents are not, therefore, liable to income tax under IRC.* Those who are so liable are as follows:

(a) General rule. (1) Section 1 of the Code [IRC] imposes an income tax on the income of every individual who is a citizen or resident of the United States . . .

(b) Citizens or residents of the United States liable to tax.

(c) Who is a citizen. Every person born or naturalized in the United States and subject to its jurisdiction is a citizen. [Emphasis added.] [26 CFR § 1-1.1]

Wherefore, the only citizens or residents of the six States of the United States who are liable to income tax under IRC are citizens or residents (actual or legal) of the District of Columbia.

¹⁴⁸gunsel . . . slang : a treacherous person . . . GUNMAN *Merriam-Webster’s Unabridged Dictionary*, inc. version 2.5, s.v. “Gunsel.”

gunman . . . a criminal whose crimes involve the use of a gun : KILLER; especially : one hired to kill another with a gun Ibid, “Gunman.”

¹⁴⁹“Agency” and “agent” are both corporate/commercial (not governmental) terms and do not appear in any de jure foundational instrument of the United States of America; *to wit*:

AGENCY. A relation, created by express or implied contract or by law, whereby one party (called the principal or constituent) delegates the transaction of some lawful business or the authority to do certain acts for him or in relation to his rights or property, with more or less discretionary power, to another person (called the agent, attorney, proxy, or delegate) who undertakes to manage the affair and render him an account thereof. . . . *Black’s Law Dictionary*, 2nd ed., s.v. “Agency.”

AGENT. One who represents and acts for another. Ibid, s.v. “Agent.”

Who is a citizen of the District of Columbia?

Anyone born or naturalized in the geographical United States, i.e., the District of Columbia (*supra*: n. 141 et. seq.; “Geographical sense,” p. 38; 26 CFR § 1-1.1(c), p. 39), is a citizen of the District of Columbia and liable to income tax; wherefore: by operation of law, such persons retain *legal residence* in the District of Columbia no matter where in the world they may live, work, or travel (*see* “territorial jurisdiction,” *supra*, p. 2; “resident,” “domicile,” *infra*).

Who is a resident of the District of Columbia?

“Resident” is defined, in pertinent part, as follows:

RESIDENT. One who has his residence in a place. The term is an elastic one and may mean a person who is domiciled at a place, or a citizen, or merely one who is temporarily living at a place, or carries on business there. . . . [Emphasis added.] [*Black’s Law Dictionary*, 3rd ed., s.v. “Resident”]

“Domicile” is defined, in pertinent part, to be:

The residence of a person or corporation for legal purposes. — Also termed . . . legal residence. [U/L emphasis added.] [Ibid, 7th ed., s.v. “Domicile”]

“Though the idea of permanent home is the central practical feature of domicile, Lord Cranworth’s definition has a deceptive simplicity, for domicile . . . is a conception of law employed for the purpose of establishing a connection for certain legal purposes between an individual and the legal system of the territory with which he either has the closest connection in fact or is considered by law to have because of his dependence on some other person.” R.H. Graveson, *Conflict of Laws* 185, 7th ed. 1974. [U/L emphasis added.] [*Black’s Law Dictionary*, 7th ed., s.v. “Domicile”]

Wherefore, anyone upon whom Government confers the *franchise*¹⁵⁰ of that certain political right (*infra*, n. 150) to receive Social Security retirement or survivor benefits—**whether former slave or former sovereign**—and who accepts the said franchise and is entitled to said political right, acquires legal residence in the District of Columbia and is (1) a member of the class defined as *Federal personnel*, (2) a United States Government employee, (3) a so-called *individual* and *citizen of the United States*, (4) a so-called *person*, with civil rights conferred by Congress, (5) the subject of all legislation within the District of Columbia, (6) a citizen of the federal government, and (8) a taxpayer liable for payment of his “fair share” of interest on the national debt incurred by Congress and owed to the Federal Reserve—a private, tax-exempt,¹⁵¹ for-profit business run by foreign principals—in the form of income (and other) taxes (*supra*, n. 31; 26 CFR § 1-1.1, p. 39).

Whose salary/wages are subject to levy (seizure) for non-payment of income tax?

IRC § 6331(a) *Authority of Secretary*, the levy statute of IRC, is unambiguous as to whose salary/wages are subject to levy/seizure for non-payment of income tax; *to wit*, *in pertinent part*:

Levy may be made upon the accrued salary or wages of any officer, employee, or elected official, of the United States, the District of Columbia, or any agency or instrumentality of the United States or the District of Columbia. . . . [Emphasis added.]

¹⁵⁰FRANCHISE. A special privilege conferred by government upon an individual or corporation, and which does not belong to the citizens of the country generally. . . . In a popular sense, the political rights of subjects and citizens are franchises. . . . [Emphasis added.] *Black’s Law Dictionary*, 2nd ed., s.v. “Franchise.”

¹⁵¹SEC. 7. . . . Tax exemption. Federal reserve banks, including the capital stock and surplus therein, and the income derived therefrom shall be exempt from Federal, State, and local taxation, except taxes upon real estate. Federal Reserve Act of December 23, 1913, H. R. 7837, 38 Stat. 251.

The Secretary in “Authority of Secretary” is the so-called Secretary of the Treasury, a foreign agent and proxy (*supra*, n. 104) of British principals of the private Federal Reserve (creditor of the United States Congress and Government), with plenary unilateral executive power and authority over the Federal Reserve System (*supra*, n. 105), who answers to no one in the United States Government, including Congress and the President of the United States—a de facto, if not titular, receiver in bankruptcy. The Secretary of the Treasury levies/seizes the salary/wages of no person/citizen/subject other than those enumerated in IRC § 6331(a).

The global “debt crisis”.

Quod nullius esse potest, id ut alicujus fieret nulla obligatio valet efficere. Those things which cannot be acquired as property, cannot be the object of an agreement.

—Injuria absque damno. Injury or wrong without damage. A wrong done, but from which no loss or damage results, and which, therefore, will not sustain an action.¹⁵²

Nuda pactio obligationem non parit. A naked agreement does not create an obligation.

Opanin Gyaami, a 1983 graduate of Loma Linda University (Loma Linda, California) with a degree in dentistry, mistakenly sends payments to the university rather than the issuing bank on his “federally guaranteed” \$50,000 student loan. As of June 2010, Dr. Gyaami’s debt on the original promissory note to the bank, with interest and penalties, stands at \$522,214. The Department of Justice, who represents the United States (political District of Columbia) as holder of the note, sues him. In exchange for 3,000 Federal Reserve Notes per month the Department of Justice agrees in December 2010, to reduce the debt to \$400,000.¹⁵³

The digits the bank types into the account back in 1978 are “5-0-0-0-0.” When the doctor defaults the United States (political District of Columbia) honors its guarantee to the bank by “borrowing” more digits from the Federal Reserve in exchange for *its* promissory note; the new digits are tacked on to the imaginary (*supra*, n. 120) public debt, never to be paid down.

Neither the “United States” nor the Department of Justice wants return of the five digits; they want Federal Reserve Notes, 350,000 of which are not in circulation. Because of the Fed’s control of Congress, the CEO of the District of Columbia, and “legal” system, Dr. Gyaami cannot discharge his “debt” in bankruptcy court and must sally forth into the marketplace and engage his neighbors in the hope of acquiring 350,000 of *their* Federal Reserve Notes (*hereinafter* “FRNs”).

We know from Mr. Hoskins (*supra*, n. 39) that the usury contract is fraudulent no matter the medium, because the amount needed for interest payments does not exist (not in circulation). Under common law, the contract by which our dentist obtains the “loan” is unenforceable because (1) the object of the loan agreement—computer-keypad keystrokes of digits—cannot be acquired as property (maxim of law, *supra*); and (2) the bank sustains no loss or damage as a result of Dr. Gyaami’s failure to tender payment as agreed (*injuria absque damno*, *infra*, n. 152).

The problem is that there are no more courts of common law.¹⁵⁴ Today’s courts, both State and Federal, operate under authority of the CEO of the District of Columbia, in his alternate role as Commander in Chief¹⁵⁵ (also known as the *Executive and President of the United States*).

¹⁵²*Black’s Law Dictionary*, 2nd ed., s.v. “Injuria.”

¹⁵³*Los Angeles Times*, “Paying up is like pulling teeth,” November 12, 2012, A1.

¹⁵⁴*Ref. Erie Railroad v. Tompkins*, 304 U.S. 64, 58 S. Ct. 817, 82 L. Ed. 1188 (1938).

The first absurdity we “allow,” beginning June 30, 1864, i.e., that “state” means one of the territories or the District of Columbia, turns the Declaration of Independence and Constitution on their head and is behind every other absurdity since then; *e.g.*: The War Department is called the “Defense” Department; *assassination* (illegal), “targeted killing”; and *government borrowing*, “government spending”—and FRNs, the equivalent of goldsmith false deposit receipts and Bank of England bank-notes (“money”), represent not wealth but *debt*, and are valueless, inconvertible, inflationary tokens, created in the Federal Reserve goldsmith-bankers’ costless “loan” process.

The transition from common law to administrative law is a long process of inculcation of the new “reality” over the generations. For the first 120+ years there are *state* (government) banks, which are warehouses for goods (specie: gold and silver coins), the warehouse receipts for which property are Gold and Silver Certificates (unconditional promises to pay specie/money on demand), and inflation is a non-issue. Today’s banks are *national* (Lat. *natio* birth, race, people, nation) i.e., *private*, and “issue” and “store” electronic digits, but do keep a few FRNs (interest-bearing tokens) laying around for their “old-fashioned” customers; their chief product is inflation.

Necessitas publica major est quam privata. Public necessity is greater than private.

Nul ne doit s'enrichir aux depens des autres. No one ought to enrich himself at the expense of others.

Via Congress’ “local powers of legislation” in the *political* (municipally incorporated) District of Columbia, and personal jurisdiction over Americans (Social Security franchisees; *supra*, nn. 131, 150) whose legal residence is the *geographical* District of Columbia, **America is run under executive-branch statutory (municipal/Roman civil) law**; and British goldsmith-bankers, owners of the private Federal Reserve, enjoy a government-protected monopoly over the banking business—whose regulations (administrative law) are enforced by the CEO (Commander in Chief) of the political District of Columbia and his territorial army of alphabet-soup agents and “legal” system—and enrich themselves at the expense of the American People.

Except for numerous debt-free countries in the Middle East (a clue as to why there is so much “trouble” in that part of the world), almost every other government, in greater or lesser degree, is in the same predicament as Dr. Gyaami: hopelessly “indebted” to those who exercise a monopoly over the worldwide banking system under the protection of the CEO of the District of Columbia, a/k/a Commander in Chief. The media,¹⁵⁶ master dissemblers, are indispensable to the hoax. We find in the written word of the ancients that the solution for the degeneration and rupture of society caused by goldsmith-bankers, via their customs of usury and “money creation,” is that they be put to death. Could the current global “debt crisis” be a contemporary manifestation of the same kind of event in ages past that prompted adoption and implementation of such policy?

The situation.

The only real obstacle standing between the goldsmith-bankers and their plans for mankind is the sovereignty of the American People. Commandeering for their personal and fraternal use the executive power and armed forces of almost every other political entity proves simple: Infiltrate, seduce, buy off, entrap, bribe, or blackmail and co-opt (or murder) the sovereign authority.

¹⁵⁵*Supra*, n. 145; and *Official Opinions of the Attorneys General of the United States advising the President and Heads of Departments in relation to their Official Duties*, vol. 34, “National Flag of the United States,” May 15, 1925, 483–487. [See also Nelson, *Purging America of the Matrix*, nn. 78–80, pp. 27–28.]

¹⁵⁶The origin of the contemporary planetary banking, legal, taxation, and media paradigms traces to the same place at roughly the same time: the one-square-mile City of London (est. 1141 A.D.), c. 12th century A.D.

Not so easy a task in the American Republic: The American People, the “author and source of law,” are the self-governing, self-protecting creators of the United States of America, in whom resides supreme political power and authority. The unique nature of this particular sovereign authority (millions of constituent members) is not susceptible to the goldsmith-bankers’ usual tactics of usurpation, requiring that they go after the next best thing available: Congress. Thereafter, it is only a matter of devising a plan that will escape detection by the sovereign American People and directing Congress to implement it.

Once upon a time, in a faraway land . . .

“How to snatch from the sovereign American People their Liberty and place them under the discretionary power of the executive that we control?” says one Bank of England goldsmith-banker to the other.

“Change the legal meaning of the word they use to describe the territory in which they enjoy their sovereignty, “State,” to mean territory that we control via our hirelings in Congress,” says the other in response, “but do it during wartime (in an internal war that we create) so no one will notice. Thereafter, when they see that particular word in a legislative act, they will think it means the one thing, when ‘legally’ it means the other (as defined by us), and we can impose our will on them, through our servants on Capitol Hill—and get away with it—because of the American People’s foolish trusting nature.”

“The subject matter of the first legislative act to which we attach it should have broad public support, such as ‘civil rights for slaves’ or ‘freeing the slaves,’ so there is no real resistance,” says the first. “We can ‘free the slaves’ from involuntary servitude and at the same time, subject everyone—including the slaves—to voluntary servitude based on their erroneous belief that they reside in a ‘State’ and the ‘United States’ and are ‘citizens of the United States,’ all of which terms, of course, shall mean District of Columbia.”

“Not everyone will buy it; we need to get them all to enter into a binding contract without knowing it and from which there is no apparent escape—and the contract should ‘rescue’ them from something, so they are predisposed to agree to whatever we offer. To begin with, why not give them loans of easy credit through the banking monopoly we shall institute in the District of Columbia in 1913 and persuade them to borrow and purchase stock in the stock market, because ‘everyone knows the stock market is going up’—it costs us nothing to do so and we can secure the loans with their land and property—and then crash the stock market, contract the availability of credit so the economy dives into a depression, and foreclose and evict them from their farms and homes and toss them out on the street, just like we did in ancient Rome,” the second replies.

“Most excellent,” says the first. “Then we can pretend to save them from potential financial destitution through what appears to be a personal retirement program (for which they need to apply, of course), but is actually a government franchise, with political rights and duties—the right to receive (but not realize) retirement benefits, and the duty to pay income tax and payroll taxes for the retirement of other franchisees and administration of the program, which our puppets in Congress legislate into existence under local powers of legislation of the corporate District of Columbia (which retirement program is domiciled in territory over which Congress exercise absolute exclusive personal legislative power and jurisdiction)—thereby establishing the franchisees’ residence, for legal purposes, in the District of Columbia and making them subjects of all legislation therein and nullifying and defeating the provisions of their supreme legislative instrument, the Declaration of Independence, whereby we effectively usurp their Liberty without them even knowing what happened!” he says in conclusion.

Remedy.

Ubi jus, ibi remedium. Where there is a right, there is a remedy.

Qui jure suo utitur, nemini facit injuriam. He who uses his legal rights, harms no one.

Under the dictates of their other “employer,” Congress bamboozle the American People into volunteering for their own personal and national demise based on their erroneous belief as to the meaning of “State,” “United States,” and the 14th Amendment “citizen of the United States.”

The Declaration of Independence (*supra*, p. 30) provides remedy: to alter or to abolish that certain *form of Government* (municipal corporation) that is destructive of the unalienable Rights guaranteed by that instrument, and remove from their position of Trust those Congressmen who violate, in letter or spirit, its provisions and aid and abet the original perpetrators of the fraud.

No American whose actual or legal residence is the District of Columbia, however, has any such right; only those with the same standing as the sovereign creators of the United States of America in 1776. Notwithstanding the foregoing, mistakes are forgivable in law—and if legal residence in the District of Columbia is a consequence of a contract, such as the Social Security contract, to which one’s *apparent* consent was given and obtained by and through his *mistake*, said contract is subject to extinguishment by rescission, as authorized by law; *to wit*:

1550.

It is essential to the existence of a contract that there should be:

1. Parties capable of contracting;
2. Their consent;
3. Lawful object; and,
4. A sufficient cause or consideration. [Emphasis added.]

1565.

The consent of the parties to a contract must be:

1. Free;
2. Mutual; and,
3. Communicated by each to the other. [Emphasis added.]

1567.

An apparent consent is not real or free when obtained through:

1. Duress;
2. Menace;
3. Fraud;
4. Undue influence; or
5. Mistake. [Emphasis added.]

1688.

A contract is extinguished by its rescission.

1689. . . .

(b) A party to a contract may rescind the contract in the following cases:

- (1) If the consent of the party rescinding, or of any party jointly contracting with him, was given by mistake, or obtained through duress, menace, fraud, or undue influence, exercised by or with the connivance of the party as to whom he rescinds, or of any other party to the contract jointly interested with such party.¹⁵⁷ [Emphasis added.]

Non consentit qui errat. He who errs does not consent.

¹⁵⁷Timeless and universal contract law and, in pertinent part, *California Civil Code*.

Any native-born American (whether former slave or sovereign) whose legal residence in the District of Columbia comes by way of *mistake*, need only produce evidence that demonstrates that fact and contradicts and overcomes the *prima facie evidence*¹⁵⁸ thereof (Social Security contract), whereupon the inference of legal residence in the District of Columbia is a nullity (legally void) and he rejoins the sovereign constituency.

For the reader who wishes to avail himself of such remedy, but is unfamiliar with how this might be done, the discourse by this writer entitled *Purging America of the Matrix*, published October 22, 2012, provides, beginning on browser-page 40 thereof, two sample instruments for the reader's erudition (commentary on their application begins on browser-page 31).

Declaration of Independence: The hope of Mankind.

Cujusque rei potissima pars principium est. The principal part of everything is the beginning.

Quod prius est verius est; et quod prius est tempore potius est jure. What is first is truest; and what comes first in time, is best in law.

Derativa potestas non potest esse major primitiva. The power which is derived cannot be greater than that from which it is derived.

The principal and truest part of the United States of America is *The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America* of July 4, 1776, which provides, in pertinent part, that all men, not just the American People, are “created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these, are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness.”

The sovereign act that is the Declaration of Independence is the first and only of its kind in which a group of men with a collective sense of decency toward their fellow man, choose—upon pain of death—independence over servility and prevail against tyranny and establish, under the common law, a sanctuary of personal liberty where people are free of subjection to the statutes of legislatures and menace of executive power, and whose doors are open to one and all.

In contravention of these ideals, goldsmith-bankers of the former private Bank of England and current private Federal Reserve run the American Republic via their agents in Congress—afforded by intentional production of confusion in the public mind as to the meaning of certain key words—as their own private business, toward realization of their ultimate plans of commercial-political enslavement, or worse, of mankind. The greatest threat to their “dreams” is that solitary memorial to courage and compassion for all men that sets forth the unalienable Rights of the American People and provides remedy for the instant situation that faces us all, i.e., that certain supreme, organic instrument of creation of the American Republic, from which all descendant legislative instruments, including the Constitution, derive their power and authority and to which each must hew in both letter and spirit for legitimacy: *The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America* of July 4, 1776.¹⁵⁹

Before one's personal act can acquire purchase as that of one of the sovereign creators of the United States of America, however, he must overcome, as authorized by law, the *prima facie* evidence of the contract, by way of which he is construed to be bereft of such standing.

¹⁵⁸PRIMA FACIE. Lat. At first sight ; on the first appearance ; on the face of it ; so far as can be judged from the first disclosure ; presumably. *Black's Law Dictionary*, 2nd ed., s.v. “Prima facie.”

—Prima facie evidence. . . . Evidence which suffices for the proof of a particular fact until contradicted and overcome by other evidence. Ibid, s.v. “Evidence.”

¹⁵⁹There is more to the Declaration of Independence than meets the eye. For exposition of the import and signification of its provisions, see Nelson, *Purging America of the Matrix*, 2–7.

Summary and conclusion.

How many Americans are aware that, legally speaking:

- Upon admission to the Union in 1959 (*supra*, n. 126), Hawaii would lose its status as a State of the United States?
- Guam is a State of the United States (*supra*, n. 144, et seq.), but Hawaii is not?
- The so-called *State of Hawaii* is a political subdivision of the District of Columbia (*supra*, p. 27) and society of Federal personnel and United States Government employees (mainly Social Security franchisees) residing within the geographical limits of Hawaii but whose legal residence is the District of Columbia?
- Every official banking, corporate, and tax-agency utterance of the proper noun:
 - “United States” (sans “of America”) or “U.S.” or “US” (not U.S.A. or USA) means either:
 - The District of Columbia (only); or
 - The collective of the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands and no other thing; and
 - “State” means either the District of Columbia or one of the *five insular U.S. territories/possessions with its own respective government and tax system*—nearly always the District of Columbia?
- The 14th Amendment *citizen of the United States* is a person, subject, citizen of the federal government, legal resident of the District of Columbia, and taxpayer?

The Americans who are liable to income tax, per the Declaration of Independence, are those who knowingly, willingly, intelligently, deliberately, and voluntarily *consent to be governed by Congress*¹⁶⁰; today (in keeping with the letter and spirit of that instrument) reflected in an internal-revenue base consisting of (1) officers, employees, and elected officials who draw a paycheck from the Government of the United States, and (2) people who physically reside in or realize gains/profits/income from a source located in territory over which Congress are authorized to exercise personal legislative power, amounting to about 1% of the American population. Of the other 99%, those who pay taxes of any kind do so voluntarily.

“How can this be?” you may ask.

The sovereign is the “author and source of law,” not the subject of it; and in America—**as everyone in government routinely reminds us**—the People (as of July 4, 1776) are sovereign.

There are dozens of different taxes imposed on native-born Americans, none of which are compulsory; only as agreed to by contract duly executed in the absence of duress, menace, undue influence, fraud, and mistake—a very rare agreement indeed.

Every corporation, alphabet-soup agency, bank, and other type of institution organized under the aegis of the political (municipally incorporated) District of Columbia (constituted via the Act of February 21, 1871, and maintained as such continuously since that time) is subject to immediate dissolution, upon abolishment—**unilaterally, summarily, and without litigation or recourse**—of that particular *form of Government* by those Americans expressly identified as *the People* and authorized to do so in *The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America* of July 4, 1776, the supreme organic law of the American Republic.

¹⁶⁰Nelson, *Purging America of the Matrix*, 7.

The only thing holding the entire charade in place today is the “cooperation” of the 99% in paying taxes, mainly income tax (*see* “Full faith and credit,” *supra*, n. 139). Should but a fraction of them access lawful remedy and extinguish, by rescission, the contract by which they gave, by mistake, their apparent consent to be governed by Congress, and cease “volunteering” for their own personal impoverishment and national ruin, the rate of inflation will start to take off Zimbabwe-style, and Congress and the goldsmith-bankers, if they hope to conceal the fraud of the fractional-reserve shell game any further, will have to cool their torrid relationship and cut back dramatically on trafficking in fictitious digits, whereupon—for the first time—the tide will turn on the executive-branch alphabet-soup-agency espionage, false-flag, and conflict-instigation apparatus and political-District of Columbia war machine’s access to “an undeterminable amount of abstract money” for worldwide commercial-military imperialism and aggression.

The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America of July 4, 1776—cornerstone of the American Republic and only instrument of its kind in history—provides remedy for the instant *national* situation, timeless and universal contract law for the *personal*.

The sovereignty of the United States resides in the people, and Congress cannot invoke the sovereignty of the people to override their will as declared in the Constitution. . . .¹⁶¹

At this writing (following the Sandy Hook Elementary School tragedy) we read that the CEO of the District of Columbia is weighing his options under “local powers of legislation” of that municipal corporation, and contemplating new regulations (executive-branch administrative law) for enactment by Congress under the territorial clause of the Constitution, Article 4 § 3(2), to restrict the ability of residents, actual and legal, of the District of Columbia to acquire guns.

The above, of course, is only the legal meaning of the sanitized reports put out by the media, who would have you believe that the President of the United States (key pawn¹⁶² and tool of the goldsmith-bankers), is authorized to exercise personal jurisdiction over everyone in America.

Love it or hate it, the 2nd Amendment nevertheless operates as the single greatest safeguard to the venal, arbitrary, and deadly grasp of executive power over the life, liberty, and property of everyone—a potential menace correctly anticipated by the Framers of the Constitution.

Though the best of its kind in history, the Constitution nevertheless is pocked with certain unmistakable and potentially fatal defects (now likely easily detectible by you), implanted therein by traitors in service of principals of the Bank of England.

The order of things is confounded today because Congress exercise, by way of certain acts of fraud and treason, personal legislative power and jurisdiction over nearly all of the otherwise sovereign American People. If things do improve, it will be because enough of them decide to purge the American body politic of the same usurious parasites known to infest nearly every other earnest effort over the last 5,000+ years to create a sustainable society (religious or political) and honest, non-inflationary circulating medium and restore order as established as of July 4, 1776.

The question, then, is if native-born Americans will continue to abide the unremitting treachery of Congress and sacrifice their labor, wealth, liberty, and life for the longevity and aggrandizement of the fractional-reserve-banking Moloch¹⁶³ known as the Federal Reserve and the British goldsmith-bankers who own it, or access remedy as authorized by law. ■

¹⁶¹*Perry v. United States*, 294 U.S. 330 (1935). [Also cited *supra*, p. 4.]

¹⁶²pawn . . . a slave held as security for debt *Merriam-Webster’s Unabridged Dictionary*, inc. version 2.5, s.v. “Pawn.”

¹⁶³Mo·loch . . . n. 1. a deity, mentioned in the Bible, whose worship was marked by the burning of children offered as a propitiatory sacrifice by their own parents. II Kings 23:10; Jer. 32:35. 2. anything conceived of as requiring appalling sacrifice . . . *Random House Dictionary*, unabridged ed., s.v. “Moloch.”